

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

JOSÉ ROBLES

HAZELTON SPENCER

---

VOLUME L

1935

---

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1935





# TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

	PAGE
Davis, Arthur L., Fontane and the German Revolution of 1848...	1
Frank, Grace, Wine Reckonings in Bodel's <i>Jeu de S. Nicolas</i> .....	9
Painter, Sidney, The Sources of <i>Fouke Fitz Warin</i> .....	13
Williams, Edwin B., Portuguese Intervolic n.....	16
Brenner, Clarence D., Some Notes on Volange and Janot.....	18
Fredrick, Edna C., <i>L'Été de la Saint-Martin</i> and <i>Le Consentement forcé</i> .....	21
Friedman, Arthur, Goldsmith's <i>Life of Bolingbroke</i> and the <i>Biographia Britannica</i> .....	25
Drew, Helen L., The Date of Burke's <i>Sublime and Beautiful</i> .....	29
Fletcher, Edward G.—Defoe on Milton.....	31
McCue, G. S., A Seventeenth-Century Gulliver.....	32
Reichart, W. A., Washington Irving, the Fosters, and the Forsters..	35
<del>Jones, Frederick L., Two Notes on <i>Epipsychidion</i></del> .....	40
<del>Jones, Claude E., Christ a Fury?</del> .....	41
Weber, Carl J., Care and Carelessness in Hardy.....	41
Grant, E. M., Victor Hugo and the Doctrine of the Right to Work..	71
Lancaster, H. C., Lope's <i>Peregrino</i> , Hardy, Rotrou, and Beys.....	75
Meritt, Herbert, An OE. Gloss: <i>Ober Eliman. Inmannorum</i> .....	77
Young, Karl, A Note on Chaucer's Friar.....	83
Train, Lilla, Chaucer's <i>Ladyes Foure and Twenty</i> .....	85
Chappell, L. W., Another "Canterbury Tale".....	87
Cassidy, F. G., Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in <i>Beowulf</i> ....	88
DuBois, A. E., <i>Beowulf</i> , 489-490.....	89
Baugh, A. C., The Chronology of French Loan-Words in English.....	90
Krumpelmann, J. T., Hoodlum.....	93
Withington, Robert, "Water Fastand".....	95
Reeves, W. P., A Second MS. of Wyclif's <i>De Dominio Civili</i> .....	96
Thompson, D. W., Belphegor in <i>Grim the Collier</i> and Riche's <i>Farewell</i>	99
Lotspeich, H. G., Spenser's <i>Urania</i> .....	141
Wurtsbaugh, Jewel, Thomas Edwards and the Editorship of the <i>Faerie Queene</i> .....	146
Heffner, Ray, The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser, 1715	151
Stirling, Brents, Two Notes on the Philosophy of <i>Mutabilitie</i> .....	154
Koller, Kathrine, Identifications in <i>Colin Clout's Come Home Againe</i>	155
Schulze, Ivan L., Elizabethan Chivalry and the <i>Faerie Queene's</i> Annual Feast .....	158
Lemmi, Charles W., Symbolism in <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II. 12.....	161
<del>Lemmi, Charles W., The Serpent and the Eagle in Spenser and Shelley</del>	165✓
Grubb, Marion, A Brace of Villains.....	168
Grubb, Marion, Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's <i>Bradamante</i> .....	169
Allen, Don Cameron, Hotspur's Earthquake.....	171

	PAGE
McIlwraith, A. K., The Printer's Copy for <i>The City-Madam</i> .....	173
Cameron, Alice, Desportes and Ariosto: Additional Sources in the <i>Orlando</i> and the <i>Liriche</i> .....	174
Robles Pazos, J., Sobre la Fecha de <i>Fuente Ovejuna</i> .....	179
Arnold, H. H., The Most Difficult Passage of <i>Don Quijote</i> .....	182
Wade, Ira, Voltaire and Baillet's Manual of Pseudonyms.....	209
Crowley, F. J., Some Neglected Letters of Voltaire.....	215
Lindsay, J. I., Coleridge Marginalia in Jacobi's <i>Werke</i> .....	216
Kies, Paul P., Lessing and Burnaby.....	225
Feise, Ernst, Der Hexameter in Goethes <i>Reineke Fuchs</i> und <i>Hermann     und Dorothea</i> .....	230
Carrière, J.-M., A French Adaptation of <i>Sandford and Merton</i> .....	238
Jones, Claude, A Smollett Letter.....	242
Malakis, Emile, Another Feminine Answer to Chateaubriand's Slight- ing Remarks About Venice in 1806.....	243
Malakis, Emile, Chateaubriand se méprend-il sur Avramiotti?.....	249
Jackson, D. K., Four of Poe's Critiques in the Baltimore Newspapers	251
Gohdes, Clarence, The 1876 English Subscription for Whitman.....	257
Steinhauer, H., The Symbolism in Hauptmann's <i>Veland</i> .....	258
Dale, G. I., "Une tranche de vie".....	265
Tatlock, J. S. P., The Date of the <i>Troilus</i> : and Minor Chauceriana..	277
Wager, Willis J., The So-Called Prologue to the <i>Knight's Tale</i> .....	296
Ross, Woodburn O., Another Analogue to <i>The Prioresses Tale</i> .....	307
Weatherly, Edward H., A Note on Chaucer's Pardoner's Prologue..	310
Coffman, George R., A Note on the Miller's Prologue.....	311
Patch, Howard R., Precious Stones in <i>The House of Fame</i> .....	312
Stevenson, Hazel Allison, A Possible Relation Between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth.....	318
Shaver, Chester L., A Mediaeval French Analogue to the Dunmow Flitch.....	322
Pike, R. E., A Sixteenth-Century Substitution in the <i>Roman de     Mandevie</i> .....	325
Purcell, J. M., <i>Victorian</i> and <i>Arride</i> .....	328
Timley, M. P. and Ray, James K., Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe.....	347
Parker, William R., Symmetry in Milton's <i>Samson Agonistes</i> .....	355
Nettleton, George H., Author's Changes in Dryden's <i>Conquest of     Granada, Part I</i> .....	360
Parsons, Coleman O., Dryden's Letter of Attorney.....	364
Fletcher, Edward G., A Dryden Anecdote.....	366
Bader, A. L., The Modena Troupe in England.....	367
Talamon, René, La Marquise du <i>Bourgeois Gentilhomme</i> .....	369
Centeno, Augusto, Sobre el pasaje del <i>Quijote</i> referente al <i>Tirant lo     blanch</i> .....	375
Cameron, Alice, A Note on Desportes and Du Bellay.....	378
Kurrelmeyer, W., "Wes das Herz voll ist, des gehet der Mund über"	380

# CONTENTS

V

	PAGE
Daudon, René, <i>L'Accent allemand dans Balzac</i> .....	382
Ferguson, J. DeLancey, <i>The Plot of Conrad's The Duel</i> .....	385
Wood, Miriam Hatheway, <i>A Source of Conrad's Suspense</i> .....	390
Schneider, Elizabeth, Katherine Mansfield and Chekhov.....	394
Baudin, Maurice, <i>L'Art de régner</i> in XVIIth Century French Tragedy	417
Seeber, Edward D., <i>Anti-Slavery Opinion in the Poems of Some Early</i>	
<i>French Followers of James Thomson</i> .....	427
Beall, Chandler B., <i>Le Père Bouhours et le Tasse</i> .....	434
Crist, Clifford M., <i>Some Judgments of Voltaire by Contemporaries</i> ..	439
Crowley, Francis J., <i>Corrections and Additions to Bengesco's Biblio-</i>	
<i>graphie</i> .....	440
Centeno, Augusto, <i>La Nochebuena de 1836 y su modelo horaciano</i> ...	441
Henning, George N., <i>Baudelaire and Monstrum Horrendum, Informe,</i>	
<i>Ingens</i> .....	446
Talamon, René, <i>Porto-Riche et Rostand</i> .....	446
Wagner, Bernard M., <i>New Songs of the Reign of Henry VIII</i> .....	452
Aubin, Robert A., <i>Saint-Amant as "Preromantic"</i> .....	456
Howarth, R. G., <i>Some Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset</i> .....	457
Boyce, Benjamin, <i>A Restoration "Improvement" of Thomas Dekker</i>	460
Williamson, George, <i>Hakewill and the Arthurian Legend</i> .....	462
Williamson, George, <i>An Attribution to Suckling</i> .....	463
Churchill, Irving L., <i>Editions of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith</i> .....	464
Chickering, Geraldine J., <i>The Origin of a Ballad</i> .....	465
Maxwell, Baldwin, <i>The Date of Fletcher's The Night-walker</i> .....	487
Page, Nadine, Beatrice: "My Lady Disdain".....	494
Sorenson, Fred, "The Masque of the Muscovites in <i>Love's Labour's</i>	
<i>Lost</i> .....	499
Harbage, Alfred, <i>The Authorship of The Christmas Prince</i> .....	501
Sampley, A. M., <i>Peele's Descensus Astraeae and Marlowe's Edward II</i>	506
Wiley, A. N., <i>The Poussin Doctor</i> .....	506
Jones, Claude E., <i>Notes on Fulgens and Lucretia</i> .....	508
Metzdorf, R. F., <i>An Unpublished Johnson Letter Concerning Percy's</i>	
<i>Reliques</i> .....	509
Peck, Louis F., <i>Southey and Tales of Wonder</i> .....	513
Malone, Kemp, <i>Some Linguistic Studies of 1933 and 1934</i> .....	515

## REVIEWS

Albert Feuillerat, <i>Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman.</i>	
[J.-A. Bédé.].....	43
W. T. Bandy, <i>Baudelaire Judged by His Contemporaries (1845-1867)</i>	
[A. Schaffer.] .....	46
Thor J. Beck, <i>Northern Antiquities in French Learning and Literature</i>	
(1755-1855). [Horatio Smith.] .....	47

	PAGE
Dorothy Doolittle, The Relations between Literature and Mediaeval Studies in France from 1820-1860. [ <i>Meta H. Miller.</i> ].....	48
Dorothy Penn, The Staging of the "Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages" of the MS. Cangé. [ <i>Jean G. Wright.</i> ].....	50
H. Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue. [ <i>F. H. Wilkens.</i> ].....	52
N. B. Fagin, William Bartram, Interpreter of the American Landscape. [ <i>Lane Cooper.</i> ].....	54
L. H. Meeks, Sheridan Knowles and the Theatre of his time. [ <i>A. E. DuBois.</i> ] .....	56
Arthur Christy, The Orient in American Transcendentalism. [ <i>P. H. Boynton.</i> ] .....	58
C. K. Hyder, Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame. [ <i>S. C. Chew.</i> ] ..	59
E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley (eds.), The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason. [ <i>A. L. Smith.</i> ].....	60
E. C. Hickson, The Versification of Thomas Hardy. [ <i>P. M. Buck, Jr.</i> ] ..	61
C. J. Sharp and Maud Karpeles (ed.), English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians; E. B. Greenleaf and G. Y. Mansfield (eds.), Ballads and Sea Songs of Newfoundland. [ <i>A. K. Davis, Jr.</i> ] .....	102
G. Schütte, Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations. [ <i>K. Malone.</i> ]...	106
L. L. Schücking, Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. [ <i>S. Einarsson.</i> ] .....	108
✓ J. L. Lowes, Geoffrey Chaucer and the Development of his Genius. [ <i>R. A. Pratt.</i> ].....	111
W. O. Wehrle, The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature. [ <i>M. Henshaw.</i> ].....	113
E. K. Chambers, The English Folk-Play. [ <i>Grace Frank.</i> ].....	114
H. E. Rollins (ed.), Brittons Bowre of Delights, 1591. [ <i>E. Å. Strathmann.</i> ] .....	115
C. L. Day (ed.), The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey. [ <i>N. Ault.</i> ].....	118
H. V. Routh, The Nineteenth Century and After. [ <i>A. E. DuBois.</i> ]...	119
F. E. Ratchford and W. C. De Vane (ed.), Legends of Angria. Compiled from the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. [ <i>P. D. Proctor.</i> ] .....	121
T. Abele und M. J. Böhnert (eds.), Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten; W. Silz (ed.), German Romantic Lyrics; M. Sommerfeld (ed.), Romantische Lyrik; J. Petersen und E. Trunz (eds.), Lyrische Weltdichtung in deutschen Übertragungen an 7 Jahrhunderten. [ <i>E. Feise.</i> ].....	123
A. Jeanroy, La Poésie lyrique des Troubadours. [ <i>Grace Frank.</i> ]....	126
W. von Wartburg, Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois. [ <i>R. Levy.</i> ] ..	128
M. K. Pope, From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman. [ <i>R. Levy.</i> ].....	130
A. Tilley, Three French Dramatists, Racine, Marivaux, Musset. [ <i>J. F. Mason.</i> ] .....	131

	PAGE
L. H. Skinner, Collin d'Harleville Dramatist. [ <i>M. Baudin.</i> ].....	133
E. Eggli et P. Martino (eds.), Le Débat romantique en France, 1813-1830. [ <i>D. H. Carnahan.</i> ].....	134
Greenlaw, Osgood, Padelford (eds.), The Works of Edmund Spenser: The Faerie Queene, Book Two (Greenlaw, Heffner, McManaway, Strathmann, eds.), Book Three (Padelford, ed.). [ <i>H. J. C. Grierson.</i> ] .....	186
F. M. Padelford (ed.), The Axiochus of Plato Translated by Edmund Spenser. [ <i>Douglas Bush.</i> ].....	191
B. E. C. Davis, Edmund Spenser: A Critical Study. [ <i>Ray Heffner.</i> ].....	192
H. B. Lathrop, Translations from the Classics into English, 1477-1620. [ <i>M. Y. Hughes.</i> ].....	195
H. Hartman (ed.), Surrey's Fourth Boke of Virgill; D. C. Allen, Francis Mere's Treatise, "Poetrie." [ <i>H. B. Lathrop.</i> ].....	198
E. E. Stoll, Art and Artifice in Shakespeare. [ <i>T. M. Parrott.</i> ].....	200
Mark Eccles, Christopher Marlowe in London. [ <i>Tucker Brooke.</i> ]..	203
Wessie M. Tipping, Jean Regnaud de Segrais. [ <i>M. E. Storer.</i> ].....	204
C. W. Hendel, Jean-Jacques Rousseau Moraliste. [ <i>Albert Schinz.</i> ]....	266
Julius Peterson, Die Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in Deutscher Sage und Dichtung. [ <i>H. J. Weigand.</i> ].....	268
Edmund Blunden, Charles Lamb and his Contemporaries. [ <i>R. C. Bald.</i> ].....	271
J. T. Hatfield, New Light on Longfellow. [ <i>O. W. Long.</i> ].....	272
Ludwig Baucke, Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's "Vanity Fair"; Irene Marinoff, Neue Wertungen im Englischen Roman. [ <i>W. H. Dunn.</i> ] .....	274
P. Bourl'honne, George Eliot. [ <i>Mathilde Parlett.</i> ].....	275
F. N. Robinson (ed.), The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. [ <i>M. B. Ruud.</i> ] .....	329
B. J. Whiting, Chaucer's Use of Proverbs. [ <i>Margaret Galway.</i> ]....	332
J. W. Spargo, Chaucer's Shipman's Tale. [ <i>M. B. Ruud.</i> ].....	335
Israel Gollancz (ed.), Cleanness, Glossary and Illustrative Texts. [ <i>R. J. Menner.</i> ].....	336
G. R. Owst, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. [ <i>B. J. Whiting.</i> ] .....	338
Kaspar Rogger, Vom Wesen des Lautwandels. [ <i>Leo Spitzer.</i> ].....	341
M. Reu, Luther's German Bible. [ <i>W. Kurrelmeyer.</i> ].....	397
R. Klibansky (ed.), Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina. [ <i>F. W. Kaufmann.</i> ] .....	401
Eleanor Gertrude Brown, Milton's Blindness. [ <i>W. H. Wilmer.</i> ]....	402
R. N. Cunningham, Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718. [ <i>L. I. Bredvold.</i> ] .....	403
Edna C. Frederick, The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. [ <i>Edith Melcher.</i> ].....	404
Otto Funke, Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert. [ <i>Ants Oras.</i> ].....	405

	PAGE
Ruth C. McKay, George Gissing and his critic, Frank Swinnerton; A. H. Able, 3rd., Meredith and Peacock; E. Schneider, The Aesthetics of W. Hazlitt. [ <i>A. E. DuBois.</i> ]	407
H. Blodgett, Walt Whitman in England; F. Stovall, Walt Whitman. [ <i>Leon Howard.</i> ]	408
Frederick Page, Patmore. [ <i>O. E. Holloway.</i> ]	409
H. Reynolds (ed.), Letters to the New Island, by W. B. Yates. [ <i>F. W. O. Hersey.</i> ]	411
Josef Körner (ed.), Friedrich Schlegel, Neue philosophische Schriften. [ <i>Edwin H. Zeydel.</i> ]	468
Hans Vollmer, F. Jülcher, W. Lüdtkke, S. Birnbaum, R. Newald, Bibel und deutsche Kultur. [ <i>W. Kurrelmeyer.</i> ]	471
Olga Longi, La Terre et les Morts dans l'Œuvre de Chateaubriand. [ <i>D. H. Carnahan.</i> ]	474
E. Audra, L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope. [ <i>George Sherburn.</i> ]	475
Elizabeth Eaton Kent, Goldsmith and His Booksellers. [ <i>R. S. Crane.</i> ]	477
Thomas Philip Haviland, The Roman de longue Haleine on English Soil. [ <i>H. W. Hill.</i> ]	479
Benedetto Croce, The Defence of Poetry, Variations on the Theme of Shelley; Ernest G. Moll, The Appreciation of Poetry. [ <i>R. D. Jameson.</i> ]	480
Stanley E. Baldwin, Charles Kingsley. [ <i>Margaret F. Thorp.</i> ]	482
Gordon H. Harper, Cardinal Newman and William Froude. [ <i>Waldo H. Dunn.</i> ]	484
R. E. Zachrisson, English Place-Name Puzzles; English Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory. [ <i>Eilert Ekwall.</i> ]	535
Rudolph Kapp, Heilige und Heiligenlegende in England. [ <i>G. H. Gerould.</i> ]	543
Max Levy, Der Sabbath in England. [ <i>Harry Caplan.</i> ]	544
N. J. O'Connor, Godes Peace and the Queenes: Vicissitudes of a House 1539-1615. [ <i>Sidney Painter.</i> ]	545
George Sherburn, The Early Career of Alexander Pope. [ <i>R. K. Root.</i> ]	547
J. H. Harder, Observations on Some Tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics. [ <i>Herbert Drennon.</i> ]	548
Alice D. Snyder (ed.), S. T. Coleridge's Treatise on Method as pub- lished in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana. [ <i>M. M. Rader.</i> ]	549
C. F. Harrold, Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834. [ <i>Waldo H. Dunn.</i> ]	551

## BRIEF MENTION

Fritz Saxl (ed.), Vorträge 1930/1931: England und die Antike. [ <i>Louis I. Bredvold.</i> ]	62
H. T. Price (ed.), John Ghesel, The Rule of Health. [ <i>W. Lee Ustick.</i> ]	64

# CONTENTS

ix

PAGE

C. C. F. (ed.), Richard Hodges, A Special Help to Orthographie. [W. Lee Ustick.].....	64
C. E. P. (ed.), The Art of Limming. [W. Lee Ustick.].....	64
E. M. Sickels, The Gloomy Egoist. [Odell Shepard.].....	64
M. C. Struble, A Johnson Handbook. [Robert Kilbourne.].....	65
H. V. D. Dyson (ed.), Pope, Poetry and Prose. [George Sherburn.]	66
M. Renzulli, La Poesia di Shelley. [Odell Shepard.].....	67
S. T. Williams (ed.), Washington Irving and the Storrows. [Robert E. Spiller.] .....	67
C. I. Glicksberg, Walt Whitman and the Civil War. [Leon Howard.]	68
R. Withington (ed.), Essays and Characters, Montaigne to Goldsmith, Lamb to Thompson. [James G. McManaway.].....	68
L. Binyon (trans.), Dante's Inferno. [Lacy Lockert.].....	68
W. D. MacClintock, Joseph Warton's Essay on Pope. [R. H. Griffith.]	69
J. W. Dodds, Thomas Southerne Dramatist. [H. Spencer.].....	70
Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, XV.....	70
S. M. Tucker (ed.), Modern Plays. [H. Spencer.].....	70
M. M. Knappen (ed.), Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries. [Hyder E. Rollins.] .....	137
C. B. Judge, Elizabethan Book-Pirates. [Tucker Brooke.].....	137
I. Mahl, Der Prosastil in den Märchen C. Brentanos. [Ernst Feise.]	139
J. J. Elson (ed.), The Wits. [H. Spencer.].....	139
E. E. Willoughby, The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare. [H. Spencer.].....	139
W. Jördens, Die französischen Ödipusdramen. [H. C. Lancaster.]...	140
University of Texas Studies in English.....	140
A. C. Judson, Spenser in Southern Ireland. [H. S. V. Jones.].....	206
F. R. Johnson, A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700. [H. S. V. Jones.].....	206
E. K. Chambers, Sir Thomas Wyatt. [Frederick M. Padelford.]....	207
Rudolf Kirk (ed.), The City-Madam, by Philip Massinger. [James G. McManaway.].....	208
G. M. Priest, Anthology of the Classical Period of German Literature. [Ernst Feise.].....	276
Frederick Anderson, A Primer of Romance Philology. [Urban T. Holmes.] .....	342
R. L. Evans, Les Romantiques français et la Musique. [Gilbert Chinard.] .....	412
M. E. Storer, Contes de fées. [H. C. Lancaster.].....	413
E. Caillet, Themes of Magic. [Waldo H. Dunn.].....	413
Vachel Lindsay, The Congo, Kansas, John L. Sullivan. [H. Spencer.]	414
F. R. Johnson and S. V. Larkey, Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Infinity of the Universe in 1576. [Dorothy Stimson.] .....	415
H. C. Wyld, Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry. [R. D. Jameson.] .....	416

	PAGE
F. I. Carpenter (ed.), Emerson. [ <i>H. Spencer.</i> ]	416
Austin Warren (ed.), Hawthorne. [ <i>H. Spencer.</i> ]	416
Odell Shepard (ed.), Longfellow. [ <i>H. Spencer.</i> ]	416
Louis W. Chappell, John Henry: a Folk-lore Study [ <i>Stith Thompson.</i> ]	485
Heinz Marwell, Thomas Percy. [ <i>Herbert Drennon.</i> ]	486
W. C. DeVane (ed.), The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning. [ <i>William O. Raymond.</i> ]	486
A. V. Rao, A Minor Augustan. [ <i>John W. Draper.</i> ]	552
C. R. Baskerville, U. B. Heltzel, A. H. Nethercot (eds.), Elizabethan and Stuart Plays. [ <i>K. J. Holzknecht.</i> ]	553
Willard Thorp (ed.), Songs from the Restoration Theater. [ <i>Cyrus L. Day.</i> ]	554
Bonamy Dobrée, Modern Prose Style. [ <i>M. W. Croll.</i> ]	555
Clarence Gohdes and P. F. Baum (eds.), Letters of W. M. Rossetti. [ <i>Leon Howard.</i> ]	556
Oscar Cargill, R. E. Spiller, T. McDowell, L. Wann and J. H. Nelson (eds.), American Literature: A Period Anthology. [ <i>N. Bryllion Fagin.</i> ]	556

---

 CORRESPONDENCE

Alexander H. Krappe, The Date of Ciperis De Vigneaux.	343
Arpad Steiner, Reply	345
Alexander H. Krappe, Rejoinder.	345
Emile Malakis, Chateaubriand, Shaw, and Sannazaro.	346



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

JANUARY, 1935

Number 1

---

## FONTANE AND THE GERMAN REVOLUTION OF 1848

It has often been maintained that the poet or novelist who has an intuitive insight into those impenetrable forces which seem to determine our political and social life can comprehend the significance of contemporaneous events more profoundly and can predict the future course of things more accurately than the politician or historian himself. Theodor Fontane, one of the greatest German novelists of the nineteenth century, was apparently blessed with this singular gift.<sup>1</sup> Even a cursory reading of Fontane's works, more especially of his autobiography and letters, will reveal innumerable pertinent comments on contemporaneous affairs; a more careful investigation will bring to light passages which are characterized by extraordinary political sagacity and accuracy of prediction, and which bear witness to the fact that Fontane, throughout a long lifetime, maintained a profound interest in the momentous historical events of his century. This study is limited to a brief review of those passages in the novelist's works which reveal his attitude toward the German Revolution of 1848.

Fontane's interest in historical events, which was first aroused by his father's fascinating anecdotes concerning Napoleon and his marshals,<sup>2</sup> was greatly enhanced by a series of exciting historical happenings preceding the political upheaval of 1848, namely, the revolutionary movements of the twenties and thirties. It is little wonder, therefore, that Fontane, who was growing up amidst these many attacks upon the reactionary governments of the Metternich

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Davis, "Fontane as a Prophet of German Political Life," *MLN.*, XLVIII, 449 (Nov., 1933).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Meine Kinderjahre*, 2, I, 434, where Fontane gives a very amusing and interesting illustration of his father's teaching methods. Reference is to series, volume, and page of the *Gesamtausgabe der erzählenden Schriften in neun Bänden*, Berlin, 1925.

Era, should be attracted and, temporarily at least, influenced by the prevalent liberal atmosphere. During the period of his apprenticeship as apothecary in Berlin, 1836-1840, Fontane's free afternoons were often spent in the cafés, reading such anti-reactionary papers as *Der Beobachter an der Spree*, *Der Freimütige*, *Der Gesellschaftler*, *Der Berliner Figaro*, papers in which he undoubtedly read many articles written by adherents of "Young Germany." Again in 1840, when Fontane moved to Leipzig to begin his career as apothecary, he found himself in the very center of German liberalism, many writers, poets, and radical political leaders having been attracted by the freedom of speech and press existing at that time in the Saxon city. In the Herwegh Club, which he joined soon after his arrival in Leipzig, Fontane met, among others, Wolfsohn, Herwegh, Robert Blum, Georg Günther, and Max Müller, young liberals whose names later were to become prominent in the political and literary history of Germany. In the same year, Fontane, being at heart Prussian, experienced the new but short-lived hope for liberal reform which was aroused by the succession of Frederick William IV to the throne of the Hohenzollern. "Ich zählte," he writes, "so jung und unerfahren ich war, doch ganz zu denen, die das Anbrechen einer neuen Zeit begrüßten, und fühlte mich unendlich beglückt, an dem erwachenden politischen Leben teilnehmen zu können."<sup>3</sup>

In 1844 Fontane was back in Berlin. Two events of primary importance in the development of the young author during this year were his service in the army and his initiation into the literary club *Der Tunnel über der Spree*, also called *Der Sonntagsverein*.<sup>4</sup> About his army experience Fontane has little to say, although it is obvious that it was the foundation of his intimate knowledge of military life which plays such an important rôle in his works. *Der Tunnel*, however, continued to exercise an important influence upon his life for many years. It was here that he was introduced to Scott's works and to Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* and thereby received his schooling in ballad writing. In sharp contrast to the *Herwegh Club* in Leipzig, there prevailed here a

<sup>3</sup> *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*, 2, iv, 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Der Tunnel* is fully treated by Fontane in his autobiography *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*, 2, iv, 174 ff., and in a special study, *Friedrich Scherenberg und das literarische Berlin von 1840 bis 1860*, Berlin, 1885.

conservative spirit, and Fontane seems to have rapidly forgotten his enthusiasm for political freedom and liberal reform.

Intimate contact with both liberal and conservative elements during the forties, as well as his innate feeling for law and order, explain Fontane's change of attitude toward the Revolution which broke out in Berlin in March, 1848. His immediate but transitory reaction to this important event was probably determined, in part at least, by the circumstances of his position at Jung's apothecary shop, which was located near Alexanderplatz, and whose customers, therefore, belonged to the poorer bourgeoisie and proletariat. One can readily understand how Fontane, influenced by this environment and carried away by the enthusiasm of the crowds, was moved to participate in the insurrection, an act which was entirely foreign to his nature, and which he very soon was to regret.

As related in his autobiography,<sup>5</sup> Fontane's first impulse upon learning of the uprising was to sound an alarm, but the church to which he rushed was closed, and his attempt to force an entrance was not successful. Thereupon he joined a mob which was storming the theater in order to procure weapons, most of which of course were worthless. Seizing a gun the young revolutionist marched with the excited throng to a store where he was issued powder. As he was sitting on the steps, gun between his knees, stuffing enough powder into the barrel to blow it to pieces, a bystander remarked: "Na, hören Sie. . . ." These few simple words were enough to recall him to his senses. "Worte," he says, "die gut gemeint und ohne Spott gesprochen waren, aber doch mit einem Male meiner Heldenlaufbahn ein Ende machten."<sup>6</sup>

During the next few days Fontane learned, much to his disillusionment, how basely the revolutionists had acquitted themselves in the struggle for the realization of their ideals. At the first approach of the regular troops they had scattered, fleeing into their homes and taking refuge behind doors and chimneys, from which hiding places many had been dragged out and shot. However, after the king had ordered the soldiers to withdraw, the survivors had issued forth from their concealment to embrace each other and to extend congratulations on the event of their "glorious" victory. Confronted with such unheroic action, Fontane realized that

<sup>5</sup> *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*, 2, IV, 388 f.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 2, IV, 391.

unorganized mobs could accomplish little in the face of well-trained Prussian troops. There is no doubt that he wished for the victory of the people, but his sensitive esthetic feelings were deeply offended, and his innate predilection for law and order, replaced for a short time by an ephemeral enthusiasm for the Revolution, became dominant again. It is highly significant that not one of his lyric poems of freedom, which were written in 1848 in the style of Herwegh, was deemed by him worthy of inclusion in his collected poems.<sup>7</sup>

That Fontane, however, continued to be interested in the political significance of the Revolution and in subsequent developments, particularly the sessions of the Frankfurt Assembly, where the conflict between "Grossdeutschland und Kleindeutschland" soon reached a climax, is indicated by four political essays written by him in 1848 and published in the *Berliner Zeitungshalle*<sup>8</sup> shortly before this liberal paper was suppressed by the government. These articles, to be sure, do not represent the author's permanent convictions, but as indicative of the general mood of the time, and as articles of purely political tendency they are of considerable historical, as well as literary interest. H. Spiero writes in commendation: "... in der Knappheit ihrer Fassung, in der Bildhaftigkeit ihres Ausdrucks gehören sie zum Glänzendsten, was er je auf ein Zeitungsblatt drucken liess."<sup>9</sup>

In the first article of August 31, Fontane directly and openly attacks the weakness of Prussia. Thoroughly convinced that political leadership could no longer be expected from this source, he writes: "Preussen muss zerfallen. Seine Provinzen glichen ebenso vielen Eisenstäben, die ohne Anziehungskraft untereinander nur durch das Tau eines absoluten Willens zusammengehalten wurden. Das Tau ist mürbe geworden, es wird zerrissen, und die Eisenstäbe werden folgen, wohin der Magnet der Stammesgleichheit sie zieht."<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Fontane was persuaded that an obsolete

<sup>7</sup> P. Szczepanski, *Theodor Fontane*, Leipzig, o.J., p. 10. Cf. letter, written in 1887, to the editor of the *Kölnische Zeitung*: "Ebenso bleiben politische Gedichte ganz ohne Eindruck auf mich, wenn ich den Standpunkt des Dichters nicht teile; sehr schöne Sachen von Freiligrath, Herwegh, Heine, selbst von Platen lassen mich kalt, bloss weil ich mir sage: 'ja, das liegt aber alles ganz anders' . . ." Published in *Das literarische Echo*, 14 (1912), 1360.

<sup>8</sup> Organ of the radicals edited by Gustav Julius.

<sup>9</sup> *Fontane*, Wittenberg, 1928, p. 39.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by Spiero, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

reactionary government must yield to a younger, more vital force. This meant, in his opinion, the establishment of a Republic, which he publicly advocated, thereby allying himself with the party of the Left under the leadership of Robert Blum. "Freiheit um jeden Preis! ihr nachgestrebt, ihr jedes Opfer gebracht—das sei unveränderlich die Losung des Tages."<sup>11</sup>

This enthusiasm is somewhat abated in the third article, in which he attacks the wavering policy of the Frankfurt Assembly in the Schleswig-Holstein problem, which at that moment was so serious, that it threatened to precipitate a general European conflict. The decision of the Assembly to withdraw its active support of the provinces in their fight for freedom from Danish rule prompted Fontane to remark: "Sie schändet die Grösse und den Ruhm der Nation."<sup>12</sup> Particularly accusing Prussia of lack of sympathy for the people, he cries:

Kennt Ihr die Brücke von Arcole? Drüben die Stillstandsmänner und ihre Kanonen, hier der Fortschritt und seine Begeisterung. Gleich jenem volkentammten Korsen ergreift das Volk die Fahne der neuen Zeit, und über Leichen und Trümmer hin stürmt es unaufhaltsam zum Siege.<sup>13</sup>

Of greater importance for us are Fontane's later views on this revolutionary movement, the significance of which he was able, at a maturer age, to survey more objectively. His intuitive ability realistically to size up a situation enabled him to look at this disorganized movement as a fiasco, and he was thoroughly ashamed of his part in it, although he was not blind to the need of a revolutionary change in the organization of the government at that time. It was the method rather than the objective which offended his "Ordnungsgefühl" and his intrinsic esthetic nature.

Soon after 1848 Fontane's letters and poems, which one may consider to be the most spontaneous and direct expression of his views on the subject, contain passages which are characterized by outspoken contempt for the unsuccessful movement on the part of the bourgeoisie to force a reform of the Prussian Government. A few quotations will suffice to indicate this change of attitude.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted by H. Hass, "Theodor Fontanes politische Anschauungen," *Deutsches Volkstum* (1927), II, 815.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted by Spiero, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40. Cf. the poems "Zwei Preussen" and "Preussisches Volkslied," *Allerlei Gereimtes. Gedichte aus dem Nachlass*, hrsg. von W. Rost, Dresden, 1931, pp. 42 and 50 respectively.

In 1852, while in Brussels, Fontane's attention was called to the contrast between the spirit of 1848 in Germany and that of the city republics of the Middle Ages in Flanders. He writes to his wife: "Das waren die noblen Tage der Selbstregierung, wonach wir jetzt schreien und wozu wir nicht mehr und nicht weniger mitbringen als—nichts. Die Bürger von damals dachten und taten alles selbst; für unsre feisten Bourgeois muss gedacht und getan werden: der Götze der Bequemlichkeit hat den Gott der Freiheit in den Staub getreten."<sup>14</sup> In the bourgeoisie of Berlin Fontane observed a lack of unselfishness; their efforts for freedom had not been characterized by a heroic spirit of devotion to a great ideal.

The following poem, written about the same time, ridicules the popular assemblies of the revolutionary days.

Königtum, Adel, Stände zumal,  
Sind veraltet, sind feudal,  
.  
.  
.  
Weg damit! Die neue Zeit  
Will eine neue Gerechtigkeit.  
Lassen das Alte wir bei den Ahnen,  
Schreiben wir heut auf unsre Fahnen:  
Statt des Gesetzes, der Freiheit Netz,  
Wollen wir Freiheit vom Gesetz!<sup>15</sup>

Again, many years later, we read this significant passage in the *Vossische Zeitung*, in a criticism of Gutzkow's *Uriel Acosta*, which was in great favor at that time because of its liberal sentiment:

Es sind aber nicht bloss die "Widderhörner," deren Ton die Hörer gefangen nimmt, es ist vor allem auch der Ton, der durch das ganze Stück klingt, der Ton jenes lichtfreundlichen Liberalismus aus der zweiten Hälfte der vierziger Jahre, der mit öden Redensarten das Bestehende zu dethronisieren und eine schönere Zeit heraufzuführen trachtete. Freiheit morgens, Freiheit mittags, Freiheit abends; die Zeit, da wir nach

<sup>14</sup> Fontane, *Briefe an seine Familie*, hrsg. von K. E. O. Fritsch, Berlin, 1924, I, 9.

<sup>15</sup> *Allerlei Gereimtes*, p. 228 f. Cf. the poems "Zwei Liberale" and "Berliner Republikaner," *Gedichte*, I, I, 377 and 379 respectively. Fontane also shows great contempt for the political refugees who fled to England during the reactionary period following the revolutionary movements of 1848. Cf. *Aus England und Schottland*, p. 15: "Dann gesellen sich die französischen Flüchtlinge zu den unseren, und bei Bier und Brandy wird die Brüderlichkeit beider Völker proklamiert und beschworen . . . ein wahres Höllentreiben!"

glücklicher Absolvierung unserer Märztage stolz darauf waren, das freieste Volk der Erde zu sein, weil wir einen Freiheitsparagraphe mehr hatten als alle anderen Nationen. Nicht die geringste Sorge darüber, dass die Tage bereits vor der Tür standen, da der Freiheitswert dieser Papierparagraphe nicht grösser war als seinerzeit der Geldwert der Assignaten.<sup>16</sup>

Fontane had little sympathy with the "Menschheitsbeglucker *par force*, die gewaltsam heilen, helfen oder gar selig machen wollen."<sup>17</sup>

This opinion of the Revolution apparently did not change with the years, for in 1898, the year of his death, Fontane wrote to his friend Stephany:

Übrigens fangen die Erinnerungen an den 18. März an, scheusslich langweilig zu werden. Eine Unsumme von Nichtigkeiten türmt sich auf. Als historisches Ereignis war es eine grosse Sache, als Heldenleistung urschwach. Scharmützel. Unsere Enkel werden erst die wirkliche Schlacht zu schlagen haben.<sup>18</sup>

On the other hand it should be pointed out that Fontane was fully aware of the need of revolutions at certain epochs in the evolution of a state. In his autobiography *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig* he makes it clear that he considered the Revolution of 1848 inevitable.<sup>19</sup> The citizens were weary of the old order of things, not because they had especially suffered under it, but because they were ashamed of it. Not only were all the institutions of government antiquated, but an attempt was even being made to revive the "ancient régime." "Wiederherstellung und Erweiterung des 'Ständischen,'" surrounded by a certain halo, was proposed by those in power as the only force which could bring about "wahre Freiheit und gesunden Fortschritt." At any rate, they asserted, it would be better than a constitution, which was nothing more than a scrap of paper.

But Fontane believed that revolutions, in order to be justifiable, must be successful.

So hat denn alles Einsetzen von Gut und Blut, von Leib und Leben zunächst meine herzlichsten Sympathien, obenan die Kämpfe der Nieder-

<sup>16</sup> Fontane, *Kritische Causerien über Theater*, hrsg. von P. Schlenther, Berlin, 1905, p. 143 f.

<sup>17</sup> *Von vor und nach der Reise*, 2, I, 581.

<sup>18</sup> Fontane, *Briefe an seine Freunde*, hrsg. von O. Pniower und P. Schlenther, Berlin, 1925, II, 461.

<sup>19</sup> 2, IV, 383 ff.

länder, neuerdings die Garibaldischen. Aber noch einmal, es läuft, mir selber verwunderlich, ein entgegengesetztes Gefühl daneben her, und solange die Revolutionskämpfe des sicheren Sieges entbehren, begleite ich alle diese Auflehnungen nicht bloss mit Misstrauen (zu welchem meist nur zu viel Grund vorhanden ist), sondern auch mit einer grösseren oder geringeren, ich will nicht sagen in meinem Rechts-, aber doch in meinem Ordnungsgefühle begründeten Missbilligung.<sup>20</sup>

And revolutions which, unlike the German uprising of 1848, are more than a *Putsch*, more than a volcanic eruption, are, according to Fontane, destined to succeed; for such revolutions, being the result of a gradual, organic development, imply also the education of the people for their responsibilities, without which every insurrection is futile. Perhaps the American experiment, which interested Fontane in his later years, is a good example of this type of the political evolution of a state. In *Von vor und nach der Reise* we find this significant passage:

(Es gilt) Der Betrachtung eines beständig fortschreitenden Amerikanismus, eines eigentümlich freiheitlichen Entwicklungsganges, den zu verfolgen seit Jahr und Tag meine Passion ist. Ein solcher Appell an Gesinnung und Ehre, nicht bloss vom Standpunkte landläufiger Moral, sondern von einem Standpunkte der Ebenbürtigkeit aus, das stammt alles von drüben, das ist modern, ist amerikanisch. Und jede neue Wahrnehmung davon erquickt mich.<sup>21</sup>

In summary it may be said that Fontane, like the young German writers of the time, was influenced by the fervent enthusiasm for political reform which spread throughout Germany in 1848. But in Fontane's case it was merely a fleeting enthusiasm. His innate feeling for law and order and his intuitive insight into the deeper significance of the Revolution of 1848 soon enabled him more accurately than most men of this period to understand the mistakes in method and the deficiencies in organization of the movement which attempted to establish prematurely a new political order. Perhaps the much quoted poem which was written about 1889 sums up most pregnantly and aptly all that can be said on the subject of Fontane's attitude toward the German Revolution of 1848:

In Arkadien wurd' auch ich geboren.  
Auch ich habe mal auf Freiheit geschworen.

<sup>20</sup> *Meine Kinderjahre*, 2, 1, 423.

<sup>21</sup> 2, 1, 539.



Ich hasste Schranzen und Fürstenschmeichler,  
 Glaubte beinah an Held und Eichler,  
 Und Herwegh, Karl Beck und Dingelstedten  
 Erhob ich zu meinen Leibpoeten.  
 "Auf dem offenen Meere der Freiheit schwimmen . . .  
 Ein Volk muss immer sich selbst bestimmen,  
 Ein Volk geht immer die rechten Wege,  
 Nieder die Polizeigehege,  
 Nieder die *possidentes beati*—"  
 So dacht' auch ich. Oh, *tempi passati*!  
 Freiheit freilich. Aber zum Schlimmen  
 Führt der Masse sich selbst Bestimmen,  
 Und das Klügste, das Beste, Bequemste,  
 Das auch freien Seelen weitaus Genehmste  
 Heisst doch schliesslich, ich hab's nicht Hehl:  
 Festes Gesetz und fester Befehl."<sup>2</sup>

ARTHUR L. DAVIS

Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland

---

#### WINE RECKONINGS IN BODEL'S *JEU DE S. NICOLAS*

Schulze, Guesnon and Jeanroy have all tried to solve the reckonings of the tavern-keeper in the *Jeu de S. Nicolas*, but with results none too satisfactory even to themselves.<sup>1</sup> As Jeanroy says, these accounts are "volontairement boîteux, et c'est en cela précisément que doit consister le comique de la scène." If we are to share in this fun, however, it seems worth while attempting to discover just wherein these accounts do limp. Moreover, it appears from looking into them that Bodel is not only satirizing the mathematics of publicans, as Jeanroy suggests, but is also playing upon the Pathelinian theme of the cheater cheated, or, he robs best who robs last.

The first scene to involve a discussion of the host's wine-prices begins at line 251. *Li Tavreniers* offers his wine at the tariff of the town (258) and Auberon, the King's messenger, drinks *une pinte* (262). When Auberon comes to pay for his pint, he asks the price and is told that it costs a denier, but that if he will drink

<sup>2</sup> *Gedichte*, I, I, 33 f.

<sup>1</sup> Schulze, *ZRP.*, xxx (1906), 103 f.; Guesnon, *Moyen Age*, xii (1908), 75 f.; Jeanroy, ed. *CFMA.*, notes to lines 274-89, 680-4, 707.

another pint, he may have the second for a maille (i. e., half a denier), that is, the two pints for  $1\frac{1}{2}$  d. Take your choice, says the host in effect, "pay a denier or drink again" (274-7).

Now it is clear from these lines that the host is reckoning his wine at one denier the pint (with a reduced rate for two pints)<sup>2</sup> and that, accordingly, when he adds "c'est a douze deniers sans faille" (276), he means that 12 pints of his wine are worth 12 deniers. But what is this measure of 12 pints? Jeanroy (note to l. 707) asks the question without answering it, and Guesnon, confusing the issue by assuming that the measure must contain 4 lots, confesses he does not know. The measure, however, is most probably that mentioned in line 1038, the *broc* (Picard, *broche*) which Cotgrave defines as "a steane, great flagon, tankard or pot; holding (most commonly) twelve Parisian pints."<sup>3</sup>

Auberon, in the scene just discussed, demurs at the host's price. He is willing to pay the maille at once and later, on his return, to drink another pint and pay the denier then. But the host does not trust him and demands at least "trois partis" forthwith in payment of the wine already drunk. Guesnon and Schulze correctly interpret these "trois partis" as equal to half of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  d., that is  $\frac{3}{4}$  d. (or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  mailles, the parti being worth  $\frac{1}{2}$  maille). Jeanroy, misled by the reckoning of l. 680 f., somehow reached the conclusion that the parti was there equivalent to a demi-denier, but in this later reckoning, as in l. 817, the "trois partis" are still equivalent to  $\frac{3}{4}$  d. and, as we shall see, it is for quite another reason that the account of l. 680 f. is in error.

While Auberon is disputing with the host, Cliquet appears (290), eager for a little game of dice. Auberon and Cliquet shake for the drinks and the former wins, thereby shifting the burden of the debt to the latter. For the rest of the play it is Cliquet, a thief, who owes the "trois partis" for the messenger's drink. Cliquet

<sup>2</sup> Guesnon missed this point, unfortunately, and assumed that the price of "trois partis" was the normal price for a pint of wine, that four pints were equivalent to one lot, and that accordingly the host's later reckoning of 3 d. per lot ( $4 \times \frac{3}{4}$  d.) was correct. But it is evident from the context that the host's normal rate was 1 pint = 1 denier and that the price of  $\frac{3}{4}$  d. to Auberon was a reduction of the normal tariff.

<sup>3</sup> The *jalaye* also, according to Cotgrave, was a wine measure "containing 12 (French) Pintes," but since the *broc* is mentioned elsewhere in our text, it seems more likely to have been the vessel used.

remains at the inn and presently welcomes there a second thief, Pincédé, inviting his companion to drink and calling to the tavern-boy, Caignet, to draw the wine for them:

Bevons un denier, toute voie.

Saque nous demi lot, Caignet! (676-7)

Evidently, for Cliquet a demi lot of wine may be had for a denier. But, as we have seen above, the host's regular price for his wine was 1 d. a *pinte*. The demi lot ought therefore to be the equivalent of a pint. I think it was. Guesnon, however, assumed, as we have seen,<sup>4</sup> that in this play a lot contained four pints; Schulze did not specify but believed the lot "ein ziemlich grosses Mass," whereas Jeanroy maintained that "nous ne savons pas quel rapport il y avait entre le lot et la pinte."

Some further evidence is available on the subject. Cotgrave states that the French or Parisian *pinte* is equal to about 27 English ounces, that the *lot* contains about as much as the English *pottle*, and that the *pottle* contains 64 ounces. A lot, therefore, by Cotgrave's day was equal to about 10 ounces more than two French or Parisian pints.<sup>5</sup> This is, roughly, the relation between the lot and the pint indicated in the example cited by Godefroy (1 lot = 1 quart, or 2 pints; see note 4). It is also the equivalence known to La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, who says, s. v. *lot*, "un Artésien m'a dit qu'un lot, à Arras, étoit le double de la pinte dans le même lieu." It seems reasonable to assume therefore that in our play the demi lot was little, if any, more than the pint, and that the

<sup>4</sup> Guesnon perhaps relied upon Godefroy, who says, s. v. *lot*: "Dans l'Ile-de-France, la Picardie, l'Artois et la Flandre, le *lot* valait quatre pintes." But Godefroy gives us no proof for this statement, and it is well known that the measure varied from time to time and place to place. Indeed one of Godefroy's examples ("*Dialog. fr.-flam.*, fo 2c, Michelant") states that "le pinte nomme on en aucun lieu chopine et le *lot* une quarte" (i. e. 2 pints) and it is this equivalence of 1 lot = 2 pints that I believe is revealed by our play. Godefroy's example is from *Le Livre des Mestiers*; cf. J. Gessler's ed., III, 8.

<sup>5</sup> These figures may be verified in Cotgrave's Dictionary s. v. *lot*, *pinte*, *pottle*, *quart*. According to the same authority (s. v. *pinte*), "La pinte de S. Dennis, et de plusieurs autres lieux à l'entour de Paris. Is halfe as big again as the ordinary one of Paris," but this measure does not seem to be involved in our play.

host's normal price for his wine was 1 d. a demi lot, even as Cliquet assumes, 2 d. a lot,<sup>6</sup> and 12 d. a broc.

This, however, is *not* what the tavern-keeper proceeds to charge. He evidently knows Cliquet and his thieving companions. He also knows how to take advantage of their drunkenness. For the King's messenger he may be willing to reduce his prices slightly (2 pints for 1½ d.). But Cliquet and company are quite another matter. He cheats them roundly by charging them 3 d., sometimes 3¼ d., a lot for their wine (680, 753, 815), 2 d. for a demi-lot (753).

The first time that the new rate goes into effect, the host refrains from stating outright what he is charging (680 f.) :

Cliquet, tu devoies un lot  
Et puis un denier de ton gieu,  
Et trois partis pour le courlieu.  
Che sont cinc deniers, poi s'en faut.

And Cliquet answers :

Cinc denier soient, ne m'en chaut.  
Ainc ostes ne me trouva dur.

In other words, the host is here charging a levy of 1 d. on the game of dice, plus ¾ d. for the messenger's drink, and the rest of the "cinc deniers" (or "poi s'en faut") is the price of Cliquet's lot of wine—3¼ d.! Cliquet knows the count is false—though in his muddled condition he probably thinks it is only ¼ d. and not 1¼ d. too much—but he answers: "Let it be 5 d.; I don't care—no host ever found me hard on him."

The second time that a wine bill is mentioned (752-3),<sup>7</sup> the lot is reckoned at 3 d. (this is the lot ordered in l. 736), and the demi lot is priced, still more exorbitantly, at 2 d. (this was ordered in l. 677 and was still unconsumed l. 716). Finally, the first reckoning

<sup>6</sup> If the price were 1 d. a pint, and the lot were 10 ounces more than 2 French pints, it would still be reasonable to sell this wine at 2 d. the lot, since a slight reduction might be expected for the larger quantity. In *Courtois d'Arras*, which is roughly contemporaneous with our text, the wine is reckoned 6 d. the lot (l. 129), but the inn visited by Courtois is an exceptionally luxurious place (133-41).

<sup>7</sup> I agree with Jeanroy (note to 752-3) that it would be appropriate to attribute this speech to Caignet. Incidentally, this bill of 752-3 is not mentioned again, apparently being charged to Pincédé and Rasoir (cf. 1332); but in the end Cliquet's coat pays for both wine accounts, as well as for a loan of 11 d. plus 1 d. tax (1333).

is repeated (815), this time with a direct charge of 3 d. for the first lot, though the full bill again involves a charge of  $3\frac{1}{4}$  d.<sup>8</sup>

Now, the audience, knowing the host's original price to the King's messenger, must have greeted each new false reckoning to Cliquet and his friends with special amusement. Here, as in the dicing scene (891, 948-9) where the tavern-boy manages to abstract 3 d. for himself and thus leave the robbers only a depleted pool of 6 d. to divide between the three of them, some of the fun must surely have consisted in watching the thieves themselves being fleeced.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

### THE SOURCES OF *FOUKE FITZ WARIN*

Few mediaeval literary productions are as difficult to classify as *Fouke Fitz Warin*.<sup>1</sup> While the hero, Fulk Fitz Warin III, was a fairly well known historical figure and the story contains a number of authentic events, the extensive notes of Thomas Wright amply demonstrate its unreliability as a source for the historian.<sup>2</sup> The author shows little or no grasp of accurate chronology, an ingenious imagination in respect to genealogy and proper names, and an ardent affection for romantic and even miraculous incident. On the other hand the historical content is large enough to force one to the conclusion that it is a compilation of legends rather than a work of pure imagination.

This raises a most interesting question—where did the author gather his material? Wright and Brandin assume that he wrote for a Fitz Warin.<sup>3</sup> In that case he would undoubtedly have used the stories current in the family and household, and the work could be classified as a very unreliable family history. But on the basis of internal evidence this view seems unacceptable. While the date

<sup>8</sup> I should punctuate 816, "Hé, voire?", assuming that Cliquet here raises a feeble, ironical protest; cf. 819 (se je voeil encore) and 1351 (Il [l'oste] a pis conté qu'il ne cuide) which, together with 684 and 698-9, show that the robbers were not unaware of being overcharged.

<sup>1</sup> *Fouke Fitz Warin* (ed. Louis Brandin, in *Les Classiques Français du Moyen Age*, Paris, 1930).

<sup>2</sup> *Fulk Fitz Warine* (ed. Thomas Wright, London, 1855).

<sup>3</sup> Wright, pp. xiv-xv; Brandin, p. iv.

of composition cannot be established with absolute accuracy, Wright and Brandin agree that the existing prose version was written during the first two decades of the fourteenth century.<sup>4</sup> This version was based on an earlier one in rime which was almost certainly composed before the end of the thirteenth century.<sup>5</sup> If the work was written for a Fitz Warin, it was done under either Fulk IV or Fulk V who headed the house from about 1256 to 1264 and from 1264 to 1314 respectively.<sup>6</sup> Now the author is ignorant of certain facts that must have been well known to these two barons and even to their retainers. Hence I have grave doubts that his work should be classed as a family history inspired by a descendant of the hero.

The most striking illustration of this ignorance is found in the account of the acquisition by Fulk III of the manor of Wantage in Berkshire. The author states that it was a grant from Hugh, the earl marshal.<sup>7</sup> Brandin has pointed out that there had never been an earl marshal of that name.<sup>8</sup> The office was held from 1246 to 1306 by two Roger Bigods, uncle and nephew. The author knew that the father of the elder of these Roger Bigods was named Hugh, and he assumed that he was the head of the house at the time Wantage was acquired by the Fitz Warins and that he was earl marshal. As a matter of fact, the grantor was William Marshal the younger who later succeeded his father as earl marshal and earl of Pembroke.<sup>9</sup> In 1246 the death without issue of the last son of the great earl gave the marshal's office to Roger Bigod as the eldest son of the eldest daughter and hence senior co-heir. All this must have been well known to the Fitz Warins. Fulk IV almost certainly knew the last Marshal earls. The evidence is definite as to Fulk V. In 1284 he showed William Marshal's charter granting Wantage to Fulk III to the king's justices in answer to a writ of *quo warranto* and called to warrant Roger Bigod and his co-heirs.<sup>10</sup> It seems inconceivable that the author could have made this error if he were writing in the household and for the ear of Fulk IV or Fulk V.

There is another mistake scarcely less decisive. Hawis de Dinan,

<sup>4</sup> Wright, p. i; Brandin, pp. i-ii.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>6</sup> Brandin, pp. vi-vii.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 81.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 95, under Hue.

<sup>9</sup> *Placita de Quo Warranto (Record Commission)*, p. 81.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

wife of Fulk II, had a sister Sybil. The author apparently knew of the lady but had no idea whom she married. With his usual nonchalance in such matters he picked a name at random and joined her to Paien Fitz John.<sup>11</sup> As this gentleman preceded her father, Joyce de Dinan, as constable of Ludlow castle, this was a poor guess. Actually Sybil married Hugh de Plucknet.<sup>12</sup> As their heirs in the direct male line shared the Dinan inheritance, the manor of Chipping Lambourne in Berkshire, with the Fitz Warins as late as 1310, the latter must have been perfectly familiar with the name of Sybil's husband.<sup>13</sup>

No one who glances through Thomas Wright's notes can possibly believe that the author of *Fouke Fitz Warin* acquired any of his information from the hero, Fulk III. I believe that the evidence presented above indicates very strongly that he had no direct contact with Fulk IV or Fulk V. Thus one is forced to conclude that the legends he used were current in his native district, Shropshire. In short, if my view is correct, one may in the pages of *Fouke Fitz Warin* study the nature and accuracy of popular historical tradition in the late thirteenth century.

It is possible that another valuable inference may be drawn from the hypothesis that the author had no direct connection with the family of his subject. This trouvère did not in all probability work solely for his own amusement. If he had been writing for a Fitz Warin, the source of his expected reward would be clear, but, as it is, one is driven to assume that there existed some public demand for the story of Fulk III. This may furnish some indication of the rapidity with which a legendary hero could develop. Fulk's principal adventures took place in the first two decades of the thirteenth century and he died shortly after 1256. By the end of the century at latest, this essentially unimportant warrior had become a popular romantic figure.

SIDNEY PAINTER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

<sup>11</sup> Brandin, p. 29.

<sup>12</sup> Wright, p. 204.

<sup>13</sup> *Book of Fees (Rolls Series)*, pp. 106, 842, 848; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem (Rolls Series)*, v, 173.

PORTUGUESE INTERVOCALIC *n*

The attention that has been paid to the development of intervocalic *n* in Portuguese has not led to any clear synthesis of the facts. It has been pointed out that intervocalic *n* sometimes falls and sometimes becomes *nh*; <sup>1</sup> Nobiling <sup>2</sup> describes the development of nasal diphthongs, and Huber <sup>3</sup> mentions in a note the restoration of *n* before dentals without pointing out that this *n* is restored after the second vowel instead of in the intervocalic position. The present paper is an attempt to treat all phases of the development of intervocalic *n* as an outgrowth of one original phenomenon, namely, the nasalization of the preceding vowel and the fall of *n*.

At an early date in Portuguese, medial *n* nasalized the preceding vowel and then fell. The nasal resonance of the vowel persisted and spread to the following vowel. Later, however, it generally disappeared from both vowels: *arēnam* > *arēa* > *areia*; *corōnam* > *corōa* > *corôa*; *monāchum* > *moago* > *mogo*; *tenēre* > *tēer* > *ter*. There are a large number of important exceptions to the last stage of this regular development and it has been found possible to divide them into the following five groups:

1. If both vowels were the same and if the first vowel was tonic, the nasal resonance remained and the vowels were contracted: *lanam* > *lāa* > *lā*; *bonum* > *bōo* > *bom*; *tenes* > *tēes* > *tens*. If both vowels were posttonic *e*'s the same changes developed: *ordīnes* > *ordēes* > *ordens*; but *\*sabānam* (for *sabānum*) *savaa* (old), and *diacōnum* > *diagoo* (old). The nasal resonance remained in *orfā* (from *orphānam*) through the influence of the masculine *orfāo* and perhaps also of *irmā*. Because final unaccented *o* was pronounced *u*, words like *ūnum* belong to this category: *ūnum* > *uno* > *ūu* > *um*; *jejūnum* (adj. used as noun) > *jejūu* > *jejum*. And because final unaccented *e* in hiatus with tonic *i* became *i*, words like *fines* likewise belong to this category: *fines* > *fūis* > *fins*.

<sup>1</sup> Reinhardstoettner, *Grammatik der portugiesischen Sprache*, Strassburg, 1878, pp. 62-63; J. J. Nunes, *Compêndio de Gramática Histórica Portuguesa*, Lisbon, 1930, pp. 113-117; Jules Cornu, "Die portugiesische Sprache" in *Gröber's Grundriss*, Strassburg, 1888, I, 752-753.

<sup>2</sup> "Die Nasalvokale im Portugiesisch" in *Die neueren Sprachen*, XI (1903), § 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Altportugiesisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, 1933, § 238.



2. If the first vowel was tonic in any of the pairs: *a-o*, *o-e*, *a-e*, the nasal resonance remained and the nasal diphthongs *ão*, *õe* and *ãe* were formed: *manum* > *mão*; *germanum* > *irmão*; *lectiones* > *lições*; *pōnes* > *pões*; *canes* > *cães*. In the case of the pair *a-o* the same changes developed when both vowels were posttonic: *orphānum* > *orfão*; *orgānum* > *orgão*; *raphānum* > *rabão*; *Stephānum* > *Estevão*.

3. If the first vowel was tonic *i* and the second vowel *a* or *o*, a palatalized nasal developed between the two vowels: *vinum* > *vīo* > *vinho*; *vicinam* > *viziā* > *vizinha*; *gallinam gallia* > *galinha*. Just as a palatalized nasal developed between tonic *i* and final *a*, a labialized nasal *m* might be expected to have developed between tonic *ū* and final *a*. This did not happen, e. g., *lūnam* > *lūa* > *lua*; *\*commūna* > *comūa* > *comua*; except in the case of *ūnam* > *ūa* > *uma*, where the nasal resonance had been sufficiently intensified to bring this about, by the analogical influence of the masculine *um* [ū].<sup>4</sup>

4. If the first vowel was pretonic and the second vowel was followed by a dental, an *n* [n] developed after the second vowel: *\*cinitia* > *cēiza* > *cinza* > *cinza*; *divinitātem* > *divindade* > *divindade*; *\*manutia* > *māuça* > *maunça*; *minūtias* > *māuças* > *miunças*; *tenētis* > *tēedes* > *tendes*; *poenitentiam* > *pendença* (old). After the dental element of *ç* [ts] and *z* [dz] disappeared, the [n] also fell in pronunciation, but the nasal resonance remained: *cinza* [síza]. The presence of a dental after the second vowel did not always have the effect of producing an *n*: *monētam* > *moeda*; *vanitātem* > *vaidade*.

5. If the first vowel was pretonic and the second vowel was tonic *i* in hiatus with a following *a* or *o*, the nasal resonance spread to all three vowels. Later a palatalized nasal developed between the last two vowels (according to 3) and the nasal resonance disappeared from the pretonic vowel entirely: *litaniam* > *lidaña* > *ladainha*; *veniābam* (for *veniēbam*) > *venia* > *veña* > *vinha* > *vinha*.

EDWIN B. WILLIAMS

University of Pennsylvania

---

<sup>4</sup>See Leite de Vasconcellos, *Lições de Filologia portuguesa* (2d. ed.), Lisbon, 1926, p. 295.

## SOME NOTES ON VOLANGE AND JANOT

In *Les Œuvres Libres* for March, 1932, M. Henri Lavedan published what is there styled a *variété inédite* entitled *Volange comédien de la foire*. This same account of Volange was published last year (1933) in sumptuous book form accompanied by the text of two plays in which this actor achieved his great fame, viz., *Les Battus paient l'amende* and *Janot chez le dégraisseur*. It was decidedly worth while to resurrect the most celebrated popular French actor of the eighteenth century through whose success Dorvigny's *Les Battus paient l'amende* became the most frequently performed popular play of the same period. Not only has M. Lavedan related the story of Volange in a most entertaining manner, but he has been at considerable pains to examine the available facts and to present them accurately. The following notes supplement a few points in his study and are not intended to detract in any way from the general excellence of his effort.

In discussing Volange's early life, M. Lavedan tells us that some biographers state that the actor's father was a notary, others that he was a porter (*portefaix*). M. Lavedan gives the preference to the latter profession on the ground that it better justifies the career which the son was later to follow. There is a brief biographical account,<sup>1</sup> unknown to M. Lavedan, which states that the father was a schoolmaster. No doubt M. Lavedan would rule out the schoolmaster along with the notary, even admitting that it would be possible to reason that the youth's conduct was a reaction to the restraint imposed in a family of somewhat higher station than that of a *portefaix*.

The success of *Les Battus* was of course in large part the result of the interpretation of the principal rôle by "l'unique et multiple Volange," as M. Lavedan calls him. The second of these qualifications refers to Volange's numerous resources as an actor. He was, however, *multiple* in another sense. He made a specialty of acting a number of rôles in the same play, and the success of some of these plays seems to have been due chiefly to the versatile talent that he displayed in these various characterizations. We have some half

<sup>1</sup> F. Métra, *Correspondance littéraire secrète*, x, 338.

dozen examples of plays in which Volange played from three to eight different parts.<sup>2</sup>

As was to be expected, the directors of the Variétés Amusantes did not fail to exploit to the fullest extent the *janotmanie*, as the popular enthusiasm for Volange and Janot was straightway termed, by keeping Volange before the public and by producing three *suites* to *Les Battus*. Two of these, *Janot chez le dégraisseur* (18 October 1779) and *Ça n'en est pas* (23 December 1779), were by Dorvigny, the author of *Les Battus*. The third, *Le Mariage de Janot* (14 August 1780), was by Guillemain. It was inevitable too that other popular theatres should seek their share of glory and profit by likewise offering Janot plays. The most successful of these was a parody of *Les Battus* entitled *Jeannette ou les Battus ne paient pas l'amende*, by Beaunoir.<sup>3</sup> Others, of which very little is known, were three plays by Simonin, *Janot au salon ou le Proverbe* (1779), *Janot tout seul* (published 1801), *La Nuit de Janot* (1780), and the following by unknown authors, *Janot et Dodinet* (1780),<sup>4</sup> *La Janomanie* (1779),<sup>5</sup> *Janot enrôlé*, *Janot poète*.<sup>6</sup>

M. Lavedan calls attention to the numerous popular songs inspired by Volange and Janot.<sup>7</sup> Others besides dramatists and song writers could not resist the temptation to make use of these names. So we find a criticism of the salon of 1779 by L. J. H. Lefébure published with the title *Janot au salon*. In 1783, the author of a satirical pamphlet sought to gain a wide reading public by entitling his diatribe *Requête de Volange, dit Jeannot, à monseigneur Hue, le garde des sceaux de France*.<sup>8</sup> Such an attack upon

<sup>2</sup> In *On fait ce qu'on peut*, 1779, he played 8 rôles; in *Les fausses Consultations*, 1780, 4 rôles; in *Thalie, la Foire et les Pointus*, 1783, 5 rôles; in *Le Bienfait récompensé*, 1783, 3 rôles; in *La Fête de campagne*, 1784, 8 rôles; in *Mieux fait douceur que violence*, 1785, 3 rôles. Cp. L. H. Lecomte, *Les Variétés Amusantes*, 1908, pp. 28, 45, 55, 72, 89, 113.

<sup>3</sup> Performed at the Grands Danseurs du Roi during the summer of 1780.

<sup>4</sup> Mentioned by Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*, 1877-82, XII, 437.

<sup>5</sup> *Idem.*, XII, 348; Métra, *op. cit.*, IX, 87.

<sup>6</sup> The *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de M. de Soleinne* lists a manuscript of each of these last two plays under items 3066 and 3076 (Bibl. Nat., a. s. f. 9260, 9292). Two others plays in the same collection (3066), *Le Verrou ou Jeannot dupe de son amour* and *Les deux Jeannots*, cannot be assigned with certainty to this category.

<sup>7</sup> Several examples of these songs are given in Métra, *op. cit.*, IX, 87, 352.

<sup>8</sup> Cp. Bachaumont, *Mémoires secrets*, xxii, 275, 289, 299.

a high official could not pass unanswered, and we find the reply in a *Lettre de monseigneur le garde des sceaux au sieur Volange*.<sup>9</sup>

When the enthusiasm for Janot had worn off, he was replaced on the stage by a group of popular characters, namely the Pointu family. This new interest was created by Beaunoir with his comedy *Jérôme Pointu* (Variétés Amusantes, 13 June 1781). The play was an enormous success and Volange was considered to be even more remarkable as Jérôme than he had been as Janot.<sup>10</sup> He played in all six of the Pointu plays produced at the Variétés Amusantes, the last in 1784.

At the very end of the century another very popular character appeared upon the stage in the person of Jocrisse. His success was not comparable to that of Janot, but at least he figured in a longer series of plays. This series seems to have been started by Gouffé's *Les deux Jocrisses* in 1796, and to have ended with Saint-Hilaire and Edmond's *Jocrisse paria* in 1822.<sup>11</sup> Dorvigny, the creator of Janot, contributed two of the Jocrisse plays.

One could wish that M. Lavedan had made some mention of the rather long career that Janot has had as a popular figure. In this connection it is worth while to quote part of an interesting note appended to item 3239 of the Soleinne Catalogue apropos of Janot and Jocrisse: "Ces deux types étaient en France longtemps avant que Dorvigny songeât à les mettre en scène. Les noms de *Janot* et de *Jocrisse* ont toujours été synonymes de naïf et d'idiot. . . . Dans le *Pantagruel* de Rabelais, où le nom de *Janot* est employé déjà au figuré, *Janotus* de Bramardo débite sa fameuse harangue sur les cloches." It would no doubt be possible to find a good many examples of this type of Janot prior to Volange's incarnation of him. That Dorvigny was not the first to present this character in a play in the eighteenth century is indicated by the existence of a comedy in manuscript form, dated 1743, to which the title *Janot battu et marié* has been given.<sup>12</sup>

CLARENCE D. BRENNER

University of California

---

<sup>9</sup> Cp. *idem.*, xxiii, 8, 14.

<sup>10</sup> Cp. Lecomte, *op. cit.*, 50; Métra, *op. cit.*, xii, 107.

<sup>11</sup> For a list of the Jocrisse plays, see Soleinne Catalogue, 3239. Cp. also N. Brazier, *Chroniques des petits théâtres de Paris*, 1883, II, 143.

<sup>12</sup> Listed in the Soleinne Catalogue under 3076 (Bibl. Nat., a. s. f. 9291).

L'ÉTÉ DE LA SAINT-MARTIN AND LE CONSENTEMENT  
FORCÉ

In Meilhac and Halévy's delightful comedy, *l'Été de la Saint-Martin*, Adrienne, who has married the nephew of Briqueville without his uncle's consent, is introduced to her unsuspecting uncle-in-law as the niece of Madame Lebreton and tries to convince Briqueville that his willful nephew has not acted unwisely. So charming does Adrienne appear that Briqueville, desirous of keeping her with him always, surprises her with a proposal of marriage. His momentary disappointment and wrath, once he is informed of the real situation, are dispelled by Adrienne's impassioned plea for forgiveness and he is forced to admit that he should recognize as the wife of his nephew a young woman whom he himself was willing to marry.

*Le Consentement forcé*, a less well-known play of the 18th century dramatist, Guyot de Merville, is based on a plot very like that of *l'Été de la Saint-Martin*. Fearing that he has aroused his father's anger, Cléante takes his bride to the house of Lisimon, a family friend. The latter consents to intercede in the young couple's favor and proposes to introduce Clarice as his own niece in order that she may have the opportunity of winning Orgon's affection. And, like Adrienne, Clarice so delights Orgon that he wishes to marry her. She confesses to him that she has already married and without her "uncle's" consent. Will Orgon use his influence to obtain Lisimon's forgiveness? Orgon, still ignorant of the pretended relationship, promises to assist her, but Lisimon declares his unwillingness to forgive his "niece" unless Orgon forgives his son. When Clarice adds her entreaties to those of Lisimon, Orgon finds himself forced to relent and is thereupon informed that Lisimon's "niece" is none other than Cléante's wife.

Both comedies deal with the problem confronting the young man who has married without his guardian's consent. Since the guardian in each case refuses to see the bride, the same method of procedure is adopted, that of introducing her as the niece of a mutual friend so that she herself may obtain the affection of her husband's irate relative. Each heroine is so successful that not only does she unintentionally win admiration, but love and a proposal of marriage follow. In both comedies, the father, or uncle, is

finally forced to admit that the young couple deserves his forgiveness and his affection.

Guyot de Merville may well have furnished Meilhac and Halévy with the outline of their plot. Nevertheless it is not so much the identical situation of the two comedies which interests us as the differences in the presentation and development of that situation. A comparison of the two plays offers a tangible basis for determining some of the changes adopted during the course of the 19th century in matters of dramatic technique.

However romanesque the plot of *le Consentement forcé* may seem to us, its general outlines appear to be due to the personal experience of Guyot de Merville. His biographers repeat the following story:

Sans fortune et sans état il devint amoureux d'une demoiselle qui n'avoit d'autre mérite que sa beauté: vainement ses parens s'opposèrent à l'union qu'il vouloit contracter; sa persévérance, ses tendres sollicitations, son adresse à faire valoir les qualités de sa maîtresse, surmonterent leur résistance, et les forcèrent à consentir à un mariage qui fit son malheur. La comédie du Consentement Forcé est à peu de choses près un récit fidele de cette intrigue; le naturel charmant qui y regne est la preuve que l'auteur avoit éprouvé tous les sentimens qu'il prête à Cléante. Long-temps après ce mariage, lorsque, désabusé de l'illusion qui l'avoit égaré, l'auteur lisoit cette comédie qui inspire une gaieté si douce, il ne pouvoit retenir ses larmes: cette anecdote, rapportée par un de ses amis, montre qu'il sentoit, mais trop tard, l'étourderie qu'il avoit faite."<sup>1</sup>

Guyot de Merville, as well as Meilhac and Halévy, perceived the dramatic values latent in this particular situation and the comedy which he produced was quite successful in its day. *Le Consentement forcé* was first given at the Comédie-Française in 1738 and thereafter, until 1836, was given 284 times.<sup>2</sup> The plays of few secondary authors enjoy theatrical existence for practically one hundred years. Why did Guyot de Merville's comedy fail to survive the romantic period of French literature when a comedy with a similar plot could be successfully presented some four decades later?<sup>3</sup> The success of the 19th century comedy is probably due

<sup>1</sup> *Répertoire du Théâtre François*, Paris, 1818, XXI, 421-422.

<sup>2</sup> Joannidès, A., *La Comédie-Française de 1680 à 1920*, Paris, 1921, p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> During the first eight years of its existence (1873-1880), there were 107 performances of *l'Été de la Saint-Martin*. The total number of performances until 1920 was 266 (Joannidès, *op. cit.*, p. 70). The play is still successfully given at the Comédie-Française.

to the fact that it is simpler,—according to our modern standards—more natural and more direct in its appeal than the 18th century comedy.

Each character in *l'Été de la Saint-Martin* is essential to the action of the play. In *le Consentement forcé*, there is the *suivante*, Toinette, whose presence certainly adds nothing to the advancement of the plot. It is unfortunate that Guyot de Merville, who was of course conforming to classical convention, did not have the courage or insight of Beaumarchais in this particular respect. The latter's Rosine (*le Barbier de Séville*) was one of the few young women to appear on the 18th century French stage unaccompanied by a *suivante* or *confidente*.<sup>4</sup> The elimination of one character in *l'Été de la Saint-Martin* avoids unnecessary scenes.

A second difference is to be noted in the manner in which the authors prepare for the climax of the comedy—the proposal of marriage by the young man's guardian. Orgon has known Clarice for one, or possibly two hours. Adrienne has been living in Briqueville's home for two weeks so that the pleasure of daily association accounts quite naturally for the latter's interest in the young woman.

Meilhac and Halévy make a much more direct approach than Guyot de Merville to the introduction and conclusion of their comedy. The former authors waste no time, as Merville does, in narrating the plan which the hero and heroine are to follow. We are admitted immediately into the presence of Adrienne and Briqueville and are allowed to infer, from suggestions given here and there, what the real situation is. The *dénouement* of *l'Été de la Saint-Martin* is as straight-forward as its beginning. Once Briqueville has been informed of the real situation, Adrienne approaches him directly and pleads for his forgiveness in a scene both natural and dramatic. In *le Consentement forcé*, on the contrary, Orgon is tricked into giving his consent because he has agreed to forgive his son if Lisimon forgives his "niece," Clarice. As the spectator knows, Lisimon is prepared to carry out just this proposition since Clarice is not his niece but Orgon's daughter-in-

<sup>4</sup> The elimination of the *suivante* was not an unprecedented innovation on the part of Beaumarchais. As early as 1741, for example, Saint-Foix conceived the idea of writing a comedy with only two characters, *Deucalion et Pirrha*.

law. The scene in the 19th century play is much more effective and less artificial because we are in suspense concerning Briqueville's ultimate decision whereas we witness the trick of Lisimon and Clarice and have no doubt about its outcome.

It is this particular incident which illustrates the essential superiority of the play of Meilhac and Halévy. In *le Consentement forcé* Orgon does not discover the truth of the situation until it is to the advantage of the lovers that he know it. Since there is no deviation in the line of action, the lovers always have the upper-hand. In *l'Été de la Saint-Martin* we have an almost complete reversal of fortune. There is a rising line of action favorable to the lovers until we reach the point where Briqueville learns the truth about the general situation. Here the line of action follows a sharp decline and, for the moment at any rate, the case of the lovers seems lost. The average 18th century suitor proceeded on his course without meeting any important reverses of fortune. Fréron was the first contemporary critic, so far as I have been able to discover, to point out this decided weakness in the plot-construction of 18th century comedy<sup>5</sup> and Beaumarchais, of course, was the first writer of French comedy to demonstrate successfully in practice (*le Barbier de Séville*) the excellence of the falling line of action as a means of arousing and sustaining the interest of the spectator. A comparison of *l'Été de la Saint-Martin* with *le Consentement forcé* illustrates the manner in which Beaumarchais' innovation was adopted by 19th century writers.

In short, although the superior dramatic technique of successful 19th century dramatists cannot fail to evoke admiration, this comparison of *l'Été de la Saint-Martin* with *le Consentement forcé* would seem to indicate that the 19th century theater may well owe a greater debt to the 18th than is commonly suspected.

EDNA C. FREDRICK

*Williamsport Dickinson Seminary*

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. his criticism of Palissot's *Tuteurs* in *l'Année littéraire*, 1754, VII, 272 f.



GOLDSMITH'S *LIFE OF BOLINGBROKE* AND THE  
*BIOGRAPHIA BRITANNICA*

In a short introduction to Goldsmith's *Life of Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke* (1770) his latest editor, J. W. M. Gibbs, says that one of the two "leading authorities" on which Goldsmith relied for facts in writing the *Life* was the *Biographia Britannica*;<sup>1</sup> but neither in his introduction nor in his notes does Gibbs give any indication that he was aware of how extensive was Goldsmith's indebtedness to this work. The truth is that fully four-fifths of the *Life* was borrowed from this single source. Although Goldsmith made some significant additions, he was content for the most part to select passages from the text and notes of the article "Saint-John" in the *Biographia* and to put them together with few changes.

A typical illustration of Goldsmith's method is the following passage on Bolingbroke's education; it shows him amplifying his source and making fairly frequent changes in diction and construction but unmistakably following the corresponding passage in the *Biographia*:

*Goldsmith's Life.*

. . . as soon as it was fit to take him out of the hands of the women, he was sent to Eton school, and removed thence to Christ Church College in Oxford. His genius and understanding were seen and admired in both these seminaries, but his love of pleasure had so much the ascendancy, that he seemed content rather with the consciousness of his own great powers, than their exertion. However, his friends, and those who knew him most intimately, were thoroughly sensible of the extent of his mind; and when he left the university, he was considered as one who had the fairest opportunity of making a shining figure in active life.

*Biographia Britannica.*

. . . as soon as it became proper to take him out of the hands of the women, he was sent to Eton school, and removed thence to Christ Church-college in Oxford. His genius and understanding were seen and admired by his contemporaries in both these places; but the love of pleasure had so much the ascendancy, as to hinder him from exerting his talents for literature in any particular performance. His friends designed him for publick business, and when he left the university, he was considered as one who had the fairest opportunity of making a shining figure in that way of an active life. With the graces of a handsome person, in whose aspect

<sup>1</sup> See *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith* (London, 1885-86), iv, 180.

*Goldsmith's Life.*

Nature seemed not less kind to him in her external embellishments than in adorning his mind. With the graces of a handsome person, and a face in which dignity was happily blended with sweetness, he had a manner of address that was very engaging. His vivacity was always awake, his apprehension was quick, his wit refined, and his memory amazing: his subtlety in thinking and reasoning was profound; and all these talents were adorned with an elocution that was irresistible.<sup>2</sup>

Goldsmith did not limit his borrowings merely to the exposition in the *Biographia*; as is clear from the following passage on Bolingbroke's settlement at Dawley after his return from exile, he also used the source material brought together in the article:

*Goldsmith's Life.*

. . . he accordingly pitched upon a seat of Lord Tankerville's, at Dawley, near Uxbridge in Middlesex, where he settled with his lady, and laid himself out to enjoy the rural pleasures in perfection, since the more glorious ones of ambition were denied him. With this resolution he began to improve his new purchase in a very peculiar style, giving it all the air of a country farm, and adorning even his hall with all the implements of husbandry. We have a sketch of his way of living in this retreat in a letter of Pope to Swift, who omits no opportunity of representing his lordship in the most amiable point of view. This letter is dated from Dawley, the country farm above mentioned, and begins thus. . . .

*Biographia Britannica.*

dignity was happily tempered with sweetness, he had a manner and address that was irresistibly engaging; a sparkling vivacity, a quick apprehension, a piercing wit, were united to a prodigious strength of memory, a peculiar subtlety of thinking and reasoning, and a masterly elocution. . . .<sup>3</sup>

*Biographia Britannica.*

. . . he pitched upon a seat of Lord Tankerville's, at Dawley near Uxbridge in Middlesex, where he settled with his lady, and indulged the pleasure of gratifying the politeness of his taste, by improving it into a most elegant villa, finely picturesque of the present state of his fortune, and there amused himself with rural employments.

We have a sketch of his Lordship's way of life at this retreat, in a letter to Dr Swift by Mr Pope, who omits no opportunity of representing his Lordship in the most amiable colours. This letter is dated at Dawley June 8, 1728, and begins thus . . . So far Mr Pope; to which I will take leave to add, from ocular testimony, that it was painted accordingly; and, what still makes it more striking,

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, iv, 183.

<sup>3</sup> *Biographia Britannica: or, the lives of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland*, v (London, 1760), 3560.

*Goldsmith's Life.*

What Pope here says of his engagements with a painter, was shortly after executed; the hall was painted accordingly in black crayons only, so that at first view it brought to mind the figures often seen scratched with charcoal, or the smoke of a candle, upon the kitchen walls of farmhouses. The whole, however, produced a most striking effect, and over the door at the entrance into it was this motto: *Satis beatus ruri honoribus*. His lordship seemed to be extremely happy in his pursuit of moral tranquillity, and, in the exultation of his heart, could not fail of communicating his satisfactions to his friend Swift. "I am in my own farm," says he, "and here I shoot strong and tenacious roots: I have caught hold of the earth (to use a gardener's phrase), and neither my enemies nor my friends will find it an easy matter to transplant me again."<sup>4</sup>

*Biographia Britannica.*

the whole is executed in black crayons only: so that one cannot avoid calling to mind, on viewing it, the figures so often seen scratched with charcoal upon the kitchen-walls of farm-houses. And, to heighten the same taste, we read over the door, at the entrance into it, this motto: *Satis beatus ruri honoribus*. In the same humour, likewise, his Lordship writes to Dr Swift. 'I am in my farm, and here I shoot strong and tenacious roots; I have caught hold of the earth, to use a Gardener's phrase, and neither my enemies nor my friends will find it an easy matter to transplant me again.'<sup>5</sup>

This passage from Goldsmith is typical of a large part of the *Life*. All of the source material which he uses, including the extensive passages quoted or paraphrased from Bolingbroke's own works, was ready at hand in the *Biographia*.<sup>6</sup>

In writing the *Life*, however, Goldsmith did something more

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, iv, 211-12. The omitted quotation from Pope is the same in both texts.

<sup>5</sup> *Biographia Britannica*, v, 3575 and 3575-76, n. BB.

<sup>6</sup> Gibbs says that Goldsmith's other principal authority was "the anonymous *Life of Bolingbroke*, published in 1752"—i. e., *Memoirs of the life and ministerial conduct, with some free remarks on the political writings, of the late Lord Visc. Bolingbroke* (London, 1752), now ascribed to David Mallet—; but that Goldsmith went directly to the *Memoirs* I think very improbable. All of the passages in the *Life* which seem to come from the *Memoirs* had already been included in the article in the *Biographia*; and in every case where Goldsmith used material from the *Memoirs* which had been paraphrased in the *Biographia*, he is closer to the paraphrase than to the original.

than merely put the material he borrowed from the text and notes of the *Biographia* into literary form. He added at least one of his characteristic ideas,<sup>7</sup> but probably his most original contributions were rather frequent reflections on Bolingbroke's character and analyses of his motives, usually only a sentence or two in length, though sometimes more extended, as in the first two and the last two paragraphs of the *Life*. He also added a number of factual details relating to Bolingbroke's life which are not in the *Biographia* or in any of the other earlier lives of Bolingbroke known to me.<sup>8</sup>

The following are the most important of these factual additions:

(1) The account of Bolingbroke's keeping Miss Gumley and of his drunkenness (*Works*, iv, 184).

(2) His authorship of verses prefixed to *Le chef d'œuvre d'un inconnu* and of "two or three things more . . . which have appeared since his death" (pp. 184-85).

(3) His trouble with his first wife (p. 185; see also p. 210).

(4) Some of the details of the difficulties with which he was faced when he came into office (pp. 188-89).

(5) Some of the details of his quarrel with Oxford (pp. 190-91).

(6) The arrival of George I and his treatment of Oxford (p. 191).

(7) The statement that the Duke of Marlborough "planted his creatures" around Bolingbroke and that an impeachment was being prepared against him (p. 193).

(8) Bolingbroke's work on the *Craftsman* (pp. 213-14).

<sup>7</sup> See *Works*, iv, 183: "This period might have been compared to that of fermentation in liquors, which grow muddy before they brighten; but it must also be confessed, that those liquors which never ferment are seldom clear." For other uses of this same figure see *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. R. S. Crane (Chicago, 1927), pp. xxiii-xxiv.

<sup>8</sup> In addition to the *Memoirs* (1752) already mentioned, I have examined the following lives: *The Life and History of the Right Honourable Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke* (London, 1754); *Memoires Secrets de Mylord Bolingbroke Ecrits par lui-même adressés au Chevalier Windham, précédés d'un discours préliminaire sur la vie de l'auteur* (Londres, 1754); "The life of Henry Saint-John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke," *Universal Magazine*, xxvi (1760), 190-94 (April), 254-58 (May), 290-95 (June): drawn from the *Biographia Britannica* but much more abridged than Goldsmith's *Life*; "The life of Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke," *Universal Museum, and Complete Magazine*, II (1766), 495-97 (October), 559-63 (November): also drawn from the *Biographia Britannica* but very much more abridged than Goldsmith's account.

(9) Facts of his last illness: his cancer and his treatment of the clergy (p. 219).

(10) A new line, "He passed the latter part of his time at home," which is added to his epitaph (p. 220).

(11) The date of his death as 12 December (p. 220).<sup>9</sup>

These additions are, however, all short. Almost all of them consist of only a sentence or two; and they form relatively a very small part of the *Life*.

These factual additions, most of which occur in the early part of the *Life*, suggest that Goldsmith started out to make it a more or less original piece of work, comparable to the other lives he had written. As it turned out, however, it is little more than a piece of hack-writing in which his contributions are almost lost sight of in the large amount of material that he borrowed.

ARTHUR FRIEDMAN

University of Chicago

#### THE DATE OF BURKE'S *SUBLIME AND BEAUTIFUL*

I should like to contribute what may be the final item in the dating of the first publication of Edmund Burke's *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, for which the date 1756 has had a curious persistence. In *Notes and Queries* for January 31, 1925,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Frederick A. Pottle assembled seven items of evidence for the date 1757, including negative testimony from the lists of books in the magazines of 1756, and positive in the appearance of the title in the 'List of New Books' in the *Literary Magazine* for April 15-May 15, 1757, and in its first reviews in the *Monthly Review* for May, 1757, in the *Critical Review* for April, 1757, and the *Literary Magazine* for April 15-May 15, 1757. Mr. Edward Bensly later called attention<sup>2</sup> to Mr. Ralph Straus' use of the date April, 1757, in his account of Burke's

<sup>9</sup> The *Memoires Secrets* gives the date as 25 November; all of the other early lives give 15 November; the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the *London Magazine* for December, 1751, give 15 December.

<sup>1</sup> CXLVIII, 80.

<sup>2</sup> *Notes and Queries*, Feb. 21, 1925, CXLVIII, 140.

dealings with Dodsley.<sup>3</sup> What has been lacking to us is the advertisement in a newspaper of the particular day of publication, the evidence Mr. Straus may have had.

There is such an advertisement. The *London Chronicle*, in the issue of April 14-16, 1757,<sup>4</sup> carries the item

*In a few Days will be publish'd*

Elegantly printed in a small Volume 8vo, Price bound 3s.

A PHILOSOPHICAL ENQUIRY into the Origin of our Ideas of the SUBLIME and BEAUTIFUL.

Printed for J. and R. Dodsley in Pallmall.

And in the second issue after that, April 19-21, 1757,<sup>5</sup> appears: "*This Day was publish'd,*" etc. This announcement is repeated in the next two issues,<sup>6</sup> the first of which lists the title under 'New Books Published this Week.'<sup>7</sup> The *London Chronicle's* review of the *Sublime and Beautiful* begins with June 9-11 and continues intermittently until July 14-16.<sup>8</sup>

Incidentally, the second edition of the *Sublime and Beautiful*, that to which Burke prefixed his *Discourse on Taste*, was thus noticed in the *London Chronicle* of January 6-9, 1759:<sup>9</sup>

*This Day was published,*

Elegantly printed in One Volume Octavo, Price 4s. 6d.

bound, the Second Edition, with an Introductory

Discourse on TASTE, and several other Additions, of

A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful. Printed for R. and J. Dodsley in Pallmall.

This item had not appeared before that date; it is once repeated in the issue of January 11-13.<sup>10</sup>

It remains that Mr. Theodore Prince has seen a copy of the first edition of the *Sublime and Beautiful* dated 1756.<sup>11</sup> By what acci-

<sup>3</sup> Robert Dodsley, London, Lane, 1910, p. 255.

<sup>4</sup> No. 46, 368.

<sup>5</sup> No. 48, 384.

<sup>6</sup> No. 49 (April 21-23), 392; No. 50, 400.

<sup>7</sup> No. 49, 391.

<sup>8</sup> No. 70 (June 9-11), 556-558; No. 73 (June 16-18), 580-581; No. 75 (June 21-23), 595-596; No. 82 (July 7-9), 26-27; No. 85 (July 14-16), 50-53.

<sup>9</sup> No. 317, 32.

<sup>10</sup> No. 319, 47.

<sup>11</sup> *Notes and Queries*, Feb. 21, 1925, CXLVIII, 140.

dent of printing some copy or copies carry that date can only be speculated. It would seem amply proved that the book was not ready for sale until April 21, 1757.

HELEN L. DREW

Rockford College

---

DEFOE ON MILTON

In volume VIII of Defoe's *Review* there are two previously unnoted Milton references.<sup>1</sup> The first, a single paragraph which appeared in the *Review* for August 18, 1711 (VIII, no. 63), provides further support for Professor Havens' statement, "There can . . . be no question that from the beginning of the century [the eighteenth] Milton's greatness was recognized by all."<sup>2</sup> The *Review* for March 29, 1712 (VIII, no. 159) is entirely devoted to Milton and the theological problem, "Whether Adam knew his Wife Eve before the Fall?" Defoe notes that Addison's *Spectator* essays have led him to write the paper "to introduce a Critical Observation which I have long since made, on the famous Mr. *Milton*."

I quote fully the first of these references, which occurs as an illustration in an essay on dullness.

The Famous Mr. *Milton* wrote two Poems, *Paradise lost*, and *Paradise regain'd*, which tho' form'd in the same Mould, the Work of the same bright Genius, yet have met with a most differing Reception in the World; the first passes with a general Reputation for the greatest, best, and most sublime Work now in the *English* Tongue, and it would be to lessen a Man's own Reputation to say any Thing less of it—The other is call'd a Dull Thing, infinitely short of the former, nothing to compare with it, and not like the same Author, and this is the Universal Opinion of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor R. D. Havens has already pointed out in *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, 1922, pp. 15 and 101-102, that Defoe in the *Review* had by 1706 imitated Milton's blank verse three times, and in one *Review* (III, no. 104, August 31, 1706) wrote: "All the regulated Life of a just and pious Man is Musick in the Eye of the Observer; the Eloquence of the Orator, the Lines of the Poet make Musick in the Soul; who can read *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Ovid*, *Milton*, *Waller*, or *Rochester*, without touching the Strings of his Soul, and finding a Unison of the most charming Influence there?"

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 22. The evidence for this statement is to be found in two articles by Professor Havens in *Englische Studien*, XI, 175-199, "Seventeenth Century Notices of Milton" and "The Early Reputation of *Paradise Lost*."

Age about these two Books: Mr. *Milton* was told this by several, for it was the Opinion then as well as now, and his Answer was this—Well, I see the Reason plainly, why this Book is not liked so well as the other, for I am sure it is the better Poem of the two, but People have not the same Gust of Pleasure at the regaining Paradise, as they have Concern at the loss of it, and therefore they do not relish this so well as they did the other, tho' it be without Comparison the best Performance.

EDWARD G. FLETCHER

*The University of Texas*

---

### A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY GULLIVER

To the list of works which may have influenced *Gulliver's Travels* should be added a little-known periodical *The Weekly Comedy, As it is Dayly Acted at most Coffee-Houses in London*, the first number of which came out 10 May, 1699.<sup>1</sup> It made use of a club-like gathering of twelve men who told stories to one another while sitting in a coffee-house. The narrative of Scribble, a newswriter, tells of the recent discovery of a fertile, pleasant island, forty-three leagues from Ireland.

*Scrib.* The Natives, I am inform'd, are such a Diminutive race of *Tom-Thumbs*, that the Discoverers first took 'em to be Children, till they came near enough the little Mortals to discern their Beards; none of them exceeding the hight of a large *Coffee-Pot*; and yet, as 'tis said, are such Little, Brisk, Nimble, hot Mettled Fellows, that they no more fear a Man of twice their Bigness, than a Knight Errant does a Monster, or a little Woman a huge Bed-fellow.

. . . [T]heir *Sheep* are no bigger than *English Rabbits*, but very delicious Food: Their Wooll being Cole Black, and their Horns as white, as Ivory. Their *Cows* are all Milk White, with Nut Brown Tailles; and are so very Large, that their Dairy-Maids are forc'd to stand bolt upright upon a Buffet-stool to Milk 'em. Their *Horses* are shap'd like our *Grey-Hounds*, but as Tall as *Asses*, their Bodies of a dun colour, with a White List down their Backs, but their Mains and Tails are finely Dappled, every single Hair being of divers Colours. Their *Mastiff-Dogs* are no bigger than *Guinea Piggs*; and yet, like the People, are of that Courage, they will Fight the Devil.

---

<sup>1</sup> The only advertisements in *The Weekly Comedy* are those for the *London Spy*; the style of the written material resembles Ned Ward's; and some of the material was included in the two-volume edition of Ward's works (1706). There can be little doubt about the authorship.



. . . I will give you the Opinion of some Learned Geographers and Mathematicians concerning it, which is this, *viz.* They do suppose, by the Littleness of the People, that this Land was formerly a *Peninsula*, Joynd by a slender *Isthmos*, to some part of *Prester-John's* Country; but in the late dreadful Earthquake, when the whole Universe was affected with so Violent a Shock, the Neck of Land was broke; and this Island being Consequently disjoyn'd from the Continent, has ever since floated up and down upon the Seas. . . .

. . . The *John* of *Leith* in *Scotland*, burthen 159 Tun, *Sanders Mac Doel* Master, Bound to *Gold-Island* in *America*, Laden with Commodities befitting the Trade of that Country, upon the 11th of *March* last, set Sail from the Port of *Leith*. The first day she had fine Weather, but met with a Storm the second, and was tumbled about the Ocean till the Sixth; . . . and [they] having repair'd her Damage, . . . found themselves by their Observation, in Lat. of 57 deg. North; where, on a suddain, they were be-Calm'd, and Surrounded with so thick a Fog that they were almost Stified: The Commander order'd one of his Crew to the Main-Top, to see if the Mist was as much condens'd Aloft; the Sailer as he was crawling up the Buttock Shrouds, heard the Looing of a Cow, which he told to the Commander, who at first gave no Credit to so improbable a story: But going up the Shrouds to satisfie himself, heard it very plain: Being thro'ly Convinc'd of what his Man inform'd him, to his great Terrour And amazement, believing his Compass had faild him, and he had unhappily fallen upon some part of *Ireland* or *Scotland*, he presently Commanded a Gun to be fir'd, hoping it might occasion some Boat to come off from Shore, that might Pilot them into a safe Harbour till the Fog was over: But upon firing the Gun, it immediatly clear'd up; and the Master, to his great Surprise, found himself Close up with Land: Upon which he cast the Lead, and found himself in but 7 Fathom Water: whereupon he let go his best Power, and sent his Boat, with his Mate and Six Men on Shore, to inform themselves what Land it was. Where they no sooner Landed, but were attack'd with a great Number of little Men, about 3 foot High, Arm'd with Bows and Arrows, which they first took to be Children, till they saluted them with a flight of their Steell Weapons, Kill'd one of the Boats Crew, Wounded the Mate and 3 more. Upon which they immediatly retir'd; and with much difficulty escap'd to their Boats. This news being brought on board, the Master Man'd his Boat with 25 of his ablest Hands, well fitted with Arms and Amunition, resolving to be further satisfied in what his Mate reported: Accordingly Lands in another part of the Island, where, at the foot of a Hill, they discover'd a stately Edifice, beautified with lovely Groves, delightful Meads, and pleasant Brooks; wanting no Improvements of either Art or Nature. They advancing forward, to take a compleat Survey of this inviting Structure, found it by its Strength and Fortification, to be a stately Castle: From whence, on a suddain, Sally'd out upon the Captain & his Crew, a mighty Gyant, Twelve Foot high, King of the Country, attended with some Hundreds of his Little Subjects, who (unacquainted with the use of Fire-Arms) ran rashly on without Fear or

Wit; and the Seamen firing upon them, Kill'd the Gyant the first Volley, with abundance of his Pygmy Soldiers; which the Seamen pick'd up like Pidgeons, and put into their Snap-Sacks, taking some Prisoners, putting the rest to Flight; then entering the Castle, found it Richly furnish'd with all Necessarys, which they Plunder'd of its best Ornaments that were light of Carriage; and so return'd to their Boat, bringing along with them the Gyants Dead Body, and their Prisoners; and retracting their intended Voyage, return'd to *Scotland*, where they made manifest their Discovery, sending the Gyants Dead Body and the Living Prisoners to *Edenbrough* Castle.

The original, it will be seen, is vague and poor in detail, never rising above the level of Grub-Street writing. Its carelessness is shown in the inconsistency in the size of the pigmies: at one time they are about fifteen inches tall, at another, three feet. Swift certainly did not copy *The Weekly Comedy*; he may, however, have taken his idea from it, making use of the following suggestions: an island originally connected with Prester John's country, the race of pigmies who greet a visitor with a flight of arrows, and the curiosities brought back by the traveler (cf. Gulliver's animals from Lilliput exhibited on the Bowling-Green at Greenwich).

An interesting feature is the date of Gulliver's first departure from Bristol, 4 May, 1699. This is almost the exact date of *The Weekly Comedy*. If the sixteen hundred odd weeks of Swift's career as a writer be added to the number of weeks in England's previous maritime history, it will be seen that the chance of picking that particular date was one in ten thousand. On the other hand, if the date be not the result of a chance-shot, three possibilities present themselves. First, Swift may have begun *Gulliver's Travels* soon after reading *The Weekly Comedy*; second, he may have made a note which he used later; or third, Swift's impression of the odd journey in *The Weekly Comedy* may have been such that in developing his own story years later, the month and year of the original came spontaneously to his mind through subconscious association of ideas.

The several details both pieces have in common and the suggestion implied by the proximation of dates indicate that *The Weekly Comedy* may have functioned as a catalyst in the presence of which Swift's imagination gave forth the material for *Gulliver's Travels*.

G. S. McCUE

*New York City*

WASHINGTON IRVING, THE FOSTERS, AND THE  
FORSTERS

When Washington Irving left Dresden in the summer of 1823 in company with Mrs. John Foster and her two daughters, Emily and Flora, he was *en route* to Paris while his friends were returning to their home in Bedford, England. The *Journals of Washington Irving*<sup>1</sup> clearly indicate the intimate friendship and constant association with this English family that Irving enjoyed during his residence in the gay Saxon capital, but many references in the Paris Journals to the Fosters are actually to the family of another Englishman, Edward Forster. This confusion<sup>2</sup> of two different families was caused in many places by Irving's carelessness in spelling and sometimes by the editors' inability to distinguish between the names of Foster and Forster in transcribing the *Journals*. The occasions when Irving was actually with the Fosters are too easily established to leave any doubt or uncertainty. After the Fosters returned to England from Dresden, Irving visited them at their home at Brickhill near Bedford in July, 1824, and wrote from there:

I arrived here from town last night on a visit to my kind Dresden friends, the Fosters, who have welcomed me as to my own home. I shall stay here seven or eight days at least.<sup>3</sup>

In the spring of 1832, while Irving was chargé d'affaires at London, he saw the Fosters for the last time.<sup>4</sup> Ten years later, though again in England, Irving did not make an effort to communicate with his old friends. Yet Mr. Hellman in his biography<sup>5</sup> says:

<sup>1</sup> Edited by William P. Trent and George S. Hellman, Bibliophile Society, Boston, 1919; *Journal of Washington Irving (1823-1824)* edited by Stanley T. Williams, Harvard University Press, 1931.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Williams suggested in a footnote that there must be two separate families, *Journal (1823-1824)*, 62.

<sup>3</sup> Pierre M. Irving, *Life and Letters of Washington Irving*, New York, 1864, II, 202. Irving actually stayed nine days, *Journal (1823-1824)*, 219-227.

<sup>4</sup> This is corroborated by the following entry of Emily Foster: "He [Irving] afterward came to see us at our home in Bedfordshire;—Then again I met him in London some years later" (*Life and Letters*, IV, 386-387; cf. also IV, 377 and 405).

<sup>5</sup> George S. Hellman, *Washington Irving Esquire*, New York, 1925, 172.

His [Irving's] diaries show that he met in Paris in 1825<sup>6</sup> both Mrs. Foster and Emily and that, a little later, he wrote Emily a letter which took him two or three days to perfect.

In the Trent-Hellman edition of the *Journals* there are the following entries:

Wednesday, November 3d, 1824.—Called at Mrs. Foster's—saw Miss F. and an English Lady, etc.—<sup>7</sup>

Friday, 5th.—Wrote Mrs. Foster—dispatched letter with one to Newton, to Miller and to Mrs. Van Wart—<sup>8</sup>

If Mrs. John Foster of Bedford and her daughter Emily had been in Paris at this time there would not be one isolated item but numerous entries with detailed information about the happy reunion of old friends. Actually a photostatic copy of the entry of November 3d reads: "Called at Mr. Forsters."<sup>9</sup> The second entry, noting the dispatch of a letter to Mrs. Foster "with one to Newton, to Miller and to Mrs. Van Wart," all of whom are known to have been in England at this time, is further proof that these are references to two different families. A reply from Mrs. Foster is recorded<sup>10</sup> by Irving on January 30, 1825.

To establish the identity of the Forster family with whom Irving first became acquainted through Thomas Moore it is useful to consult the *Memoirs* of the Irish poet during his residence in Paris. On December 21, 1820, Moore made the following entry:

Dined with McKay at the table d'hôte at Meurice's, for the purpose of being made known to Washington Irving, the author of the work which

---

<sup>6</sup> 1825 is an error as the next entries show. In August 1825 there are a few entries of meeting Foster but not Mrs. Foster or Emily. In these cases Irving's carelessness in spelling is at fault.

<sup>7</sup> II, 51.

<sup>8</sup> II, 54.

<sup>9</sup> Irving did write a little later of being with a man named Foster. These entries are brief: "Foster arrives from England," "dined at home—Newton and Foster," II, 147; "walked with Newton to Foster's," "dine at Hotel de la Reservoir with Foster and Newton," II, 149; "met Foster on the boulevard," II, 150. This is due to Irving's carelessness. The name Foster, more familiar to him than the name Forster, because of his longer association with the family of John Foster, occurs on these same pages in connection with correspondence from or to England.

<sup>10</sup> *Journals*, II, 85. Further correspondence is indicated 139, 147, 150. This last item consists of the three entries to which Mr. Hellman refers: "Aug. 26th. Write to Emily Foster; Aug. 28th. rewrote letter to E. F.; Monday 29th.—Sent letter to E. Foster."

has lately had success, the "Sketch Book"; a good looking and intelligent-mannered man.<sup>11</sup>

Thus began an interesting friendship between the two writers. Moore recorded over twenty meetings before Irving departed for England, July 11, 1821. Washington Irving referred to his constant association with Moore in a letter to Brevoort<sup>12</sup> on March 10, 1821:

I have become very intimate with Anacreon Moore, who is living here with his family. Scarce a day passes without our seeing each other, *and he has made me acquainted with many of his friends here.* [Italics mine.]

Among these friends were the Forsters,<sup>13</sup> whose acquaintance Irving made at this time and whom he saw again when he returned to Paris in 1823. Who then were these Forsters?

Edward Forster (1769-1828), son of Nathaniel Forster, a writer on political economy, became a clergyman after studying medicine and law at Oxford. In 1799 he married his second wife, Lavinia, who was the only daughter of Thomas Banks, a famous British sculptor of that time. Forster entered into engagements with booksellers and published a series of finely printed editions of standard authors. These included an edition of Jarvis's *Don Quixote*, a new translation of the *Arabian Nights* in four volumes, various dramatic authors under the titles of *British Drama*, *New British Theatre*, *English Drama*, a quarto edition of *Rasselas*, and a series of prints entitled "The British Gallery of Engravings." In the year 1803, Mr. Forster published a beautiful edition of *Anacreon* with title plates and vignettes from the pencil of Mrs.

<sup>11</sup> *Memoirs, Journals and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, edited by Lord John Russell, London, 1853, III, 182.

<sup>12</sup> *Life and Letters*, II, 37.

<sup>13</sup> Moore made the following entries in his *Memoirs*, III, 196, 199, 211, 213: Feb. 3, 1821: Had company at home: the Villamils, Washington Irving, Forster, and Story. Feb. 13th: Dined at the Forsters', a family party, and took a lesson in quadrilles from the girls in the evening. Have determined to send Anastasia to Mrs. Forster's whose usual price for girls is 100 guineas a year, but who has expressed a readiness to take her upon more moderate terms. March 19th: Bessy in low spirits at parting with our dear Anastasia, who goes today to Mrs. Forster's. Irving called near dinner time; asked him to stay. . . . March 26th: Our company Mrs. Story and cousins, Mrs. Forster, her two daughters, and Miss Bridgeman, the Villamils, Irving, . . . etc.

Forster.<sup>14</sup> In 1805 he entered into a correspondence with Sir Walter Scott<sup>15</sup> for the publication of the works of Dryden.

At the time of the return of the Bourbons to the throne of France, Mr. Forster removed with his family to Paris, wishing to procure for his children the advantages, which a residence on the continent alone could afford, and also to recruit, in some measure, his exhausted finances. He began preaching at the Protestant Church of the Oratoire and in 1818 through the influence of Mr. Canning was appointed Chaplain to the British Embassy, a position that he retained until his death ten years later.<sup>16</sup>

The friendship with such a cultured and well educated family must have given Irving real pleasure and he was probably delighted to resume this intercourse when he returned to Paris. Thomas Moore was no longer there but Irving sought out the friends of his earlier Paris stay as the following entries in the *Journal* (1823-24) show. The confusion of names is abundantly clear when we see how Irving sometimes wrote Forster and then again Foster, though very definitely referring to the family of Edward Forster:

Nov. 1, 1823. Met Lord Granard and Lady Adelaide Forbes—latter speaks about letter she had written to Moore—Mrs. Foster, wife of Chaplain to Embassy and daughter—

Nov. 17, receive letter from Mrs. Foster<sup>17</sup>—card from Mr. Foster.

Dec. 9, Invitation to Mrs. Forsters for Friday evening—

Dec. 10, Note from Mad. Bonet to whom I sent 7 Napoleons to buy embroidered handkerchiefs for Mrs. Foster.

Jan. 12, 1824. Call at Mad. Bonets and get handkerchiefs for Mrs. Foster.

Jan. 14, Dine at Mr. Forsters—Chaplain to Embassy—at dinner Lord Earley. Dr. Thurlow, nephew of the Chancellor —, Dr. —, Miss Polke, the two Miss Bridgemans etc. besides the 2 Miss Forsters.

March 29, Went to a concert at Mr. Forsters.

<sup>14</sup> That this is the same Forster family Irving met is borne out by Moore's entry in his *Memoirs*, III, 176: Dec. 4, 1820. "Find that the pretty vignettes in Forster's edition of *Anacreon* are from Mrs. Forster's drawings."

<sup>15</sup> This too must have interested Irving, who knew Scott, and had been fascinated by his personal contact with him.

<sup>16</sup> *Sermons preached at the Chapel of the British Embassy and at the Protestant Church of the Oratoire in Paris by Edward Forster, with a Short Account of his Life*. Edited by Lavinia Forster. Paris, 1828; I, i-xx. (The only copy known to me is in the British Museum.)

<sup>17</sup> This is Emily's mother but "the card" is surely a return call from Mr. Forster.

Irving saw Mr. Forster again in London<sup>18</sup> but did not meet John Foster of Bedfordshire until his arrival there on July 6.<sup>19</sup>

The fate of one of Irving's manuscripts throws still further light upon this confusion of the Forsters and Fosters. In his introduction to *Abu Hassan*, which Irving translated from the German, Mr. Hellman says:

. . . and in a journal entry of Sept 6, 1824, we find that Irving sent the manuscript to his friend Colonel Livius who at that time was in Paris, where Irving still resided. The entry is of special interest inasmuch as the manuscript now before us contains a slip of paper on which is written: "This was given to Henry by C. S. Forster. C. S. F. understood from Captain J. B. Livius that the manuscript is the writing of Washington Irving.—M. H. F." We surmise, though we have not definitely established the fact, that "Henry" and "M. H. F." were members of the Fuller family into which Emily had married, although this leaves us in some doubt as to the misspelling of her maiden name, Forster instead of Foster.<sup>20</sup>

This is the identical Forster family of Paris that has been discussed above and not the family of John Foster so intimately associated with Washington Irving's residence in Dresden. No doubt Livius, whom Moore had known in Paris<sup>21</sup> in 1820, and whose name occurs so frequently in Irving's Dresden and Paris diaries<sup>22</sup> also knew the Forsters intimately. That any member of the Foster family would err in spelling so simple a name is difficult enough to believe, but that the name Forster has made its appearance in this manner is untenable in the light of the evidence cited above.

WALTER A. REICHART

*University of Michigan*

---

<sup>18</sup> May 29, dined with Newton—Mr. Foster came in and sat part of the evening.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. footnote 3.

<sup>20</sup> *Abu Hassan* by Washington Irving, with an introduction by George S. Hellman, The Bibliophile Society, Boston, 1924, 14.

<sup>21</sup> *Memoirs*, III, 113, "I went to a concert given by Livius."

<sup>22</sup> Livius had returned to Paris by March 22, 1823 and Irving saw much of him. Cf. entries *Journal* (1823-1824), 152, 154, 156, 161, 164, 166, 172, 174, 178, 187; also *Journals*, II, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26 et al.

TWO NOTES ON *EPIPSYCHIDION*

## I.

Mary Shelley's later distaste for Emilia Viviani and the poem which she inspired, *Epipsychidion*, are demonstrated both by Mary's correspondence and by her complete silence about the poem in her published notes. It is therefore worth noticing that on October 5, 1822 (at Genoa, four months after Shelley's death), she wrote in her Journal:<sup>1</sup>

Oh, my child! what is your fate to be? You alone reach me; you are the only claim that links me to time; but for you I should be free. And yet I cannot be destined to live long! Well, I shall commence my task, commemorate the virtues of the only creature worth loving or living for, and then, may be, I may join him. Moonshine may be united to her planet, and wander no more, a sad reflection of all she loved on earth.

By the last sentence Mary seems to recall that in *Epipsychidion* Shelley represents himself as the Earth and Mary as the Moon,<sup>2</sup> and, referring to the "storms [which] then shook the ocean of my sleep, Blotting that Moon," to say that storms have indeed separated them for a while, but that with her death she (the Moon) and Shelley (the Earth) will be united again.

## II.

A glance at the following lines will show clearly that Shelley borrowed from *Paradise Lost* a very fine figure for his *Epipsychidion*.

Be there love's folding star at thy return;	Hither [to the Sun], as to their fountain, other stars
The living Sun will feed thee from its urn	Repairing, in their golden urns draw light,
Of golden fire; the Moon will veil her horn	And hence the morning planet gilds her horns.
In thy last smiles. (374-77)	(VII, 364-66)

FREDERICK L. JONES

Mercer University

<sup>1</sup> Lady Jane Shelley's *Shelley Memorials*, pp. 250-51.

<sup>2</sup> Lines 277-320.



## CHRIST A FURY?

Despite Mr. W. M. Rossetti's opinion<sup>1</sup> that the Christ seen by Shelley's Prometheus is a lifeless symbol, it seems probable that one of the furies takes this form. After all except one of the furies have vanished, Panthea looks forth twice but sees only "... a youth With patient looks nailed to a crucifix."<sup>2</sup> The host brought by Mercury, however, were visible to her and to Ione earlier in the scene. Prometheus answers his tormentor, evidently addressing the Christ before him,

O, horrible! Thy name I will not speak,  
It hath become a curse. I see, I see  
The wise, the mild, the lofty, and the just,  
Whom thy slaves hate for being like to thee. (603-6)

Later, the fury uses the words spoken by Christ on the cross, "... they know not what they do."<sup>3</sup> After the fury vanishes, Christ is not mentioned by name, nor do any of the characters address him.

*Syracuse University*

CLAUDE E. JONES

## CARE AND CARELESSNESS IN HARDY

While studying the manuscript of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* recently in the British Museum, I found fresh evidence of Thomas Hardy's well-known zeal for accuracy of description. Chapter 23 of the novel contains the statement: "Mellstock Church . . . lay some three or four miles distant from the dairy-house." The manuscript, however, reads: "two or three miles distant," with the words "two or" crossed out. That is to say, Hardy first wrote "two or three"; then changed this to a definite "three"; and finally altered it to the modern published text, "three or four." To the average reader it makes no difference, but to a man of Hardy's care for details, every mile counts. He was not content to write vaguely of being merely somewhere "on the road to Mandalay." His care is illustrated by the first sentence in chapter 39 of *Far*

<sup>1</sup> In Shelley Society's Papers, I, i, 148.

<sup>2</sup> *Prometheus Unbound*, act 1, 585-586.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 631; and *Luke*, 23: 34.

*From the Madding Crowd*: "On the turnpike road, between Casterbridge and Weatherbury, and about three miles from the former place, is Yalbury Hill." Ernest E. Leisy, one of the few visitors to Hardy's home ever to penetrate into the novelist's work-room, noticed on the wall of the study "a road map of England with Hardy's penciled memorandum of distances to various places."<sup>1</sup>

In chapter 41 of *Tess*, Hardy originally wrote, and published in the serial version of 1891: "New rafters and a new ceiling . . . would amount to a sum of forty pounds." After the novel had gone through four editions, Hardy apparently decided that the carpenter's bill was too high, for the final text reads: "a sum of twenty pounds." Yet, for all his care, Hardy sometimes made slips that are perhaps comparable to Shakespeare's sea-coast in Bohemia. This is not the place in which to try to prove (what I am convinced is quite capable of proof) that the novelist used the calendar just as carefully as he did the road-map; but in spite of this conjectured study of the calendar by Hardy,<sup>2</sup> he has admitted two chronological impossibilities into *Tess*,—slips which, so far as I know, have not yet been pointed out. The calendar for 1934 and 1935 happens to facilitate doing this.

We learn of Tess's wedding-day in chapter 32. "The thirty-first of December, New Year's Eve, was the date." By chapter 45 a year has elapsed. There we read: "Sunday was the only possible opportunity . . . Sunday morning she . . . stepped out. . . . A year had now elapsed since her marriage. . . . It was a year ago, all but a day, that Clare had married Tess." That is, it was Sunday, December 30th, just as in 1934 December 30th came on Sunday. The preceding December 31st, the wedding-day, must therefore have come on Sunday (as did December 31, 1933) unless the year of Tess's desertion was a leap-year, when her wedding-day would come on Saturday. That it did come on Saturday is made clear by the Christmas Eve shopping expedition described in chapter 23; for if Tess had been married on Sunday, no shopping would have been possible on Christmas Eve a week before. Although the wedding, then, is fixed on Saturday, Tess's mother in chapter 38 asks: "When was you married?" and Tess replies, "Tuesday." If Tess was married on Tuesday, then January first (the next day)

<sup>1</sup> *Bethel College Monthly* (Newton, Kansas), Jan. 1932, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> See "A Careful Chronology" in *The Writer* (Boston), July, 1934.

would of course be Wednesday; and the year in which January first comes on Wednesday and December thirtieth on Sunday exists only on the seacoast of Bohemia! That "Tuesday" is certainly a mistake. Hardy should have written "Saturday." Tess's Sunday walk, then, took place on December 30th. The following January first would be on Tuesday, as, for example, in 1935. In this case the following March 10th will come on Sunday; and March 10th, we learn in chapter 54, was the day on which John Durbeyfield died. In chapter 50, however, we are told that "one fine day Tess worked on" in the field till dark, and that on her way home "she was met by one of her sisters" with the news that "father is dead." If the day was Sunday, Tess would not have been working in the field. We can remove all the difficulty here by assuming that the date on Durbeyfield's "new headstone" should read "March 11th."

"Thou art perfect, then, our ship hath touched upon the deserts of Bohemia?"

CARL J. WEBER

Colby College

## REVIEWS

*Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman.* Par ALBERT FEUILLERAT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. Pp. v + 314. Yale Romanic Studies, no. VII.

Il faut prendre l'ouvrage de M. Feuillerat pour ce qu'il est et s'enorgueillir d'être: un défi lancé à la critique intuitive et une défense et illustration des méthodes universitaires, fondées sur le "document" et seules capables de mener "à des déductions d'une rigueur absolue." Ce faisant, il ouvre, non sans courage, un chapitre nouveau dans la querelle qui divise la "Sorbonne" et la critique indépendante, et qui remonte, — on se rappelle les imprécations de Remy de Gourmont contre les professeurs, — aux plus beaux jours du symbolisme. Son livre y acquiert je ne sais quelle saveur belliqueuse qui en corrige l'austérité.

M. Feuillerat gagne la partie dans la large mesure où il demeure fidèle à son principe. Son terrain de bataille est fort bien choisi. Quoi qu'il y paraisse, Proust n'a jamais eu beaucoup de chance avec la critique. Il a connu une gloire tardive, soudaine, encombrante, dont il fut le premier à se défier: mais il est mort trop tôt pour en modérer lui-même et orienter l'essor. De ce fait, l'exégèse proustienne est montée à des hauteurs de nébulosité d'où il n'était pas mauvais qu'on la fît descendre. M. Feuillerat n'a pas tort —

a priori — de nous conseiller un retour aux sources et de recommencer au commencement.

Au commencement était un projet de roman en trois volumes. Le tome I a paru en 1913 chez l'éditeur Grasset: c'est le *Côté de chez Swann*. Le tome II était en cours d'impression à la veille de la guerre, et il en reste 64 "placards" d'imprimerie, donnant environ 500 pages de texte, que M. Feuillerat a eu le mérite de rechercher et de découvrir, et qu'il compare minutieusement à la version aujourd'hui courante. Enfin, du "troisième volume" il n'existe aucun état ancien, mais, s'aidant des enseignements du second, M. Feuillerat s'efforce de le reconstituer tel qu'il eût paru chez Grasset si Proust s'en était tenu à ses projets de 1914. Cette reconstitution, moins aventureuse qu'il ne semble, est faite avec beaucoup de sagacité et de méthode et emporte notre conviction. On peut dire en somme que, grâce à M. Feuillerat, nous possédons désormais un schéma très suffisamment précis de la version ancienne du roman de Marcel Proust.

De la collation des textes il ressort sans doute possible:

(a) Que la masse des apports nouveaux a détruit la simplicité de lignes du plan primitif; (b) Que Proust a évolué moralement. La guerre, la maladie l'ont profondément mûri, aigri et changé. Tous ses personnages, sans exception, ont subi une dépréciation volontaire et malveillante; (c) Que son œuvre, fondée à l'origine sur la fiction du rêve éveillé et des souvenirs inconscients, participe, dans les textes récents, du roman d'analyse traditionnel et du roman social. "A la domination de l'instinct a succédé la contrainte de la raison et de l'intelligence"; (d) Que le style en devient sec, logique, articulé, et perd le chatolement, le velouté, le mystère, empruntés à la technique symboliste, qu'il possédait dans le *Côté de chez Swann*.

L'importance de ces conclusions n'échappera à personne. Elles sont originales et fécondes. La possibilité d'une évolution dans l'esprit et la méthode de Proust a été généralement ignorée ou niée, et toutes les théories qui rattachent à un dessein prémédité certaines caractéristiques frappantes nées en fait du hasard des additions et des retouches apparaîtront nécessairement lettre morte.

Je regrette pour ma part que M. Feuillerat ait voulu pousser plus loin ses avantages. Ou je me trompe fort, ou il ne pouvait s'y risquer sans renoncer à l'objectivité qui est sa règle et son égide. Son argumentation finale ne repose plus sur les faits: elle procède d'une idée dogmatique, j'allais dire d'une préférence, que M. Feuillerat, à la manière de Taine, nourrissait antérieurement à toute documentation. Cette idée, qu'il ne prétend point lui appartenir en propre, mais qu'il espère bien confirmer, c'est que Proust est d'abord et essentiellement un psychologue, épigone de Stendhal, de Balzac, de Fromentin, de Bourget, — la dédicace de M. Feuillerat à M. Paul Bourget, "maître du roman d'analyse," recevant ainsi sa pleine signification. Sans doute M. Feuillerat reconnaît-il très loyalement que *Du Côté de chez Swann* est un chef-d'œuvre, peut-

être même le chef-d'œuvre de Proust; mais, à tout prendre, ce chef-d'œuvre lui semblerait plutôt une séduisante erreur, le produit d'une formule juvénile, excentrique et tant soit peu démodée. Aux volumes ultérieurs, dont il souligne sévèrement les imperfections, il réserve néanmoins ses véritables complaisances, car, selon lui, Proust y découvre son chemin de Damas et y accumule les trésors douloureusement acquis de l'expérience et du savoir.

Qu'on ne se méprenne point sur ma pensée. Nier les facultés d'analyse de Proust; nier qu'elles se soient accrues avec l'âge et de plus en plus libéralement déversées dans son roman, serait une chose absurde. Mais, très exactement, qu'est-ce que cela prouve? Qu'il y a eu évolution, *non nécessairement* révolution. De fait, Marcel Proust n'a jamais renoncé à une seule des fictions primitives. Sa correspondance, ses conversations en font foi, et aussi le fait, souligné par M. Feuillerat lui-même, qu'il procédait par juxtapositions, non par suppressions, et que le texte initial subsiste quasi intact, simplement absorbé par le flot des additions postérieures. Force nous est donc bien d'admettre que Proust n'avait pas abdiqué sa première personnalité et qu'il gardait l'espoir tenace de la réconcilier un jour avec sa personnalité nouvelle. Comment? je n'en sais rien. En vérité je crois voir sans trop de peine les jalons qu'il a posés dans ce sens, mais je doute que personne, critique se fiant à ses propres lumières ou professeur penché sur les documents, puisse jamais obtenir une solution rigoureuse du problème. Pour la très simple raison que Proust a emporté son secret dans la tombe. Pour la très simple raison qu'il existe de son roman une version ancienne, heureusement restituée par M. Feuillerat, et une version nouvelle que nous fournissent les seize volumes compacts de la *Nouvelle Revue Française*; mais qu'il n'en existe pas de version *définitive*. Il faut se résigner à considérer *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu* comme une œuvre inachevée, dont nombre de pages ne sont que d'informes brouillons et dont l'auteur, s'il eût vécu et si la maladie lui avait laissé quelque répit, n'eût pas manqué de raffermir l'équilibre et d'effacer les incohérences. Quoi que l'on puisse conjecturer à cet égard, tout jugement sur Marcel Proust, y compris celui de M. Feuillerat, est d'ordre forcément relatif, puisque seul le point de départ nous est connu et que le point d'arrivée demeure mathématiquement indéfini. Et peut-être n'y a-t-il pas trop lieu de s'en plaindre. Dans ce destin incomplet d'un homme et de son œuvre, il entre un peu du pathétique qui nous rend si chères les *Pensées* de Pascal et que ne posséderait point son *Apologie* dûment revue et corrigée. Ce monument dédié à l'Art, arrêté en plein "devenir," remplit mieux son objet que s'il eût atteint le point de perfection immobile où disparaissent tous échafaudages: car nous y saisissons sur le vif les secrets de l'ouvrier et nous y suivons pas à pas les étapes passionnantes de la création intellectuelle.

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

Princeton University

*Baudelaire Judged by His Contemporaries (1845-1867)*. By W. T. BANDY. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1933. Pp. x + 188. \$1.75.

Mr. Bandy's "documentary bibliography," as he calls it in his Foreword, limits itself to "the comparatively short period of Baudelaire's literary productiveness." In a twelve-page Introduction he sketches briefly Baudelaire's literary career, and summarizes the findings of his own bibliographical researches. We learn that the publication, in volume form, of the translation of Poe's *Histoires extraordinaires* (1856)

created an *événement littéraire*; its reception by the critics was no less immediate and favorable than its adoption by the public. . . . Certainly no other of Baudelaire's works before or afterwards, including the *Fleurs du mal*, was so widely read and reviewed" (p. 4); . . . that the *Fleurs du mal* were something of an anti-climax after the popular success of the *Histoires extraordinaires*. . . . The response [to the former] was rather disappointing. Critics did not rise in a body to revile or defend the poet for his immorality or his artistry (pp. 4-5);

finally, that the events in Baudelaire's career which received the greatest attention in the Parisian press were his candidacy for a seat in the Academy and his death. "The necrological articles," we read (p. ix), "which occupy a considerable portion of the bibliography, are practically all reproduced here for the first time; they form . . . the most valuable and informative part of the work, containing numerous details previously unknown concerning Baudelaire's youth and his final illness." The Introduction concludes with a brief paragraph on the controversy aroused by Baudelaire's "conversion in extremis."

Mr. Bandy arrived at these interesting and important conclusions after a very careful study of periodical articles and books dealing with Baudelaire from 1845 to 1867, found in the files of the Bibliothèque nationale and such special collections as that of Spoelberch de Lovenjoul at Chantilly. His Bibliography is divided into two sections: "Périodiques," under which there are 255 items, and "Livres," which lists 39 items. The periodical-items are given in day-by-day chronological order, and are either summarized or quoted verbatim, often in full. The picture which they present of Baudelaire's place in the eyes of the critics and public of his day compels a revision of much of our thinking on the subject and, interestingly enough, affords rather exciting reading. The citations from books of the period carry on the controversy over Baudelaire's significance, and include the famous Hugo letter of Oct. 6, 1859, published as preface to Baudelaire's study on Gautier (Paris, Poulet-Malassis, 1859).

Mr. Bandy deserves to be commended on the zeal with which he has achieved his plan and the importance of his results. We may

note here that he has overlooked several of the items mentioned in Dr. Rhodes's Bibliography.<sup>1</sup> One serious slip is to be found in the printing of Mr. Bandy's volume; the footnotes in the Introduction constantly refer to a page-number in the Bibliography, when what is meant is the item-number; this is very baffling at first, and should be rectified as soon as possible. There are the usual misprints, but they are few and unimportant;<sup>2</sup> all in all, the little volume presents an attractive appearance and represents a distinct contribution, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Bandy will continue his Baudelaire-researches.

AARON SCHAFER

*The University of Texas*

---

*Northern Antiquities in French Learning and Literature (1755-1855). A Study in Preromantic Ideas.* By THOR J. BECK. Volume I: *The "Vagina Gentium" and the Liberty Legend.* New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, Columbia University, 1934. Pp. 195. \$2.25.

This book is learned and probably useful. When the Bibliography and Reference Index promised with a later volume are available an impressive amount of evidence will be at hand, although the user may have to work out his own pattern as to what it means. The author has read widely to investigate the growth of the idea of the North as the cradle of liberty and the source of the most vigorous and manly virtues; he goes back to Tacitus, makes more than one reference to the twentieth century. He wishes to relate his material to the origin of "French Romanticism in the accepted sense" (p. 9; as to just what this sense is he merely gives three references, to a book on English Romanticism, to an article in *RLC.*, to Monglond, *Le Prérromantisme français*). He devotes much of his space to "Mallet's epoch-making works, *Introduction à l'Histoire de Dannemarc*, 1755, and *Monumens de la mythologie et de la poésie des anciens Scandinaves*, 1756" (p. 9). Mallet is no doubt important to a specialist, but "epoch-making" suggests a twist in values frequent in doctoral dissertations. Mr. Beck gives major attention to scholars, historians, publicists — which is not inconsistent with his title. Montesquieu, Rousseau, Chateaubriand

<sup>1</sup> *The Cult of Beauty in Charles Baudelaire*, New York, Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1929. It should be added that Dr. Rhodes's bibliography of articles on Baudelaire begins only with the year 1855, and that his list for the years 1855-67 makes no claim to completeness.

<sup>2</sup> "No. 119" (p. 76, l. 5) should read "no. 120"; "indissolument" (p. 82, l. 25) is an error for "indissolublement," "mémoires" (p. 92, l. 14) for "mémoires" and "physiologique" (p. 179, l. 22) for "physionomique."

receive frequent if not always significant mention. A final chapter sums up certain of the author's summaries.

In concluding, we may say that Germanomania and the attendant Septentriomania were carried forward as elements in the preromantic movement through an interplay of three circumstances: Hotman's political school of pro-Germanism and "Gothic" democracy à la Tacitus, the Hyperborean and similar exotic legends as applied to a "Stoic" conception of his Germania, and these legends as revived by Rudbeck and Bailly with reference to Plato's Atlantis (p. 193).

Such a result, a mere enumeration, seems meager.

Critical comments consist chiefly of repetitions of "(sic!)." Sentences like the following are less than lucid:

Michelet's "cosmic" conception of history is an abandonment from a science that should deal with real facts and positive testimonies and not with metaphysical vagaries and a philosophy of history (p. 82); Reynier calls to mind that the ancients claimed to inhabit the center or navel of the Earth which they thought flat—a notion which the moderns have replaced by the idea of being native of the land which was peopled first (p. 143).

B. refers to 1749-1762 as "the 4th period" of Rousseau's life (p. 76). Why so neatly the "4th"? B. is sometimes over-definite and sometimes nebulous. In the chapter on *Germanism* and *Pantheism* the second term is used very loosely; B. seems to mean by Pantheism "the plan of an *ideal history* that is 'eternally common to all nations'" (p. 83). Translation of "le vieil homme" as "old age" (p. 126) is debatable. I do not know what B. means by an "excellent, if uncontrolled, scholar" (p. 178). The characterization of Chateaubriand as "the unscrupulous preromanticist bent on theatrical effect" (p. 166) might seem downright even to a severe Sainte-Beuve — and implies an appraisal of preromanticism that makes one ask why the author gives the phenomenon such extensive and respectful attention. Indeed there is in the whole book a certain blur. B. proposes to go on to related investigations. With his industry and determination he may presently achieve focus.

HORATIO SMITH

*Brown University*

---

*The Relations between Literature and Mediaeval Studies in France from 1820-1860.* By DOROTHY DOOLITTLE. Bryn Mawr: 1933. Pp. iv + 145.

The two-fold purpose of this thesis is to show the debt of the Romantic school of 1820-1830 to the real Middle Ages and mediaeval literature and to discover the relationship between the Romantic movement of the same decade and the scholarly movement of 1830-1845. The introduction deals briefly with the mediaeval



movement in the eighteenth century, while the first chapter makes a careful study of it in the French Romantics. Here is noted the importance of Charles Nodier, whose enthusiasm for the Middle Ages developed into propaganda among his contemporaries of the Cénacle for the use in their writing of the "culte des ruines" and of mediaeval history and literature. There follows an examination of the creative writings of 1820-1830 of Hugo, Musset, Gautier, Deschamps, Mérimée, Vigny for the treatment of these motifs. It is found that mediaeval architecture exerts a greater influence than either history or literature on the Romantics. Mention, moreover, is made of a reaction against the mediaeval movement.

The work of the scholars is divided into three periods, 1820-1830, 1830-1845, 1845-1860. Old French texts are published in constantly increasing numbers till 1845. More and more scholarly work is done in the way of collation of manuscripts and critical studies, as we progress toward 1860. Parallel to the augmenting quality of scholarship is the growth of the popularity of mediaeval literature. The reaction noted among the creative writers serves only as a stimulus to their learned contemporaries. An analysis of the public is the final step in this study. The conclusion explains the relation between the two groups. Though there were few direct personal contacts, each was indebted to the other. Early in his career, Nodier had come under the influence of certain scholars; but he was almost unique among the Romantics in his debt to them. On the other hand, the debt of the scholars to the creative writers was great; since it was they who prepared an audience for the work of the scholars.

That Miss Doolittle has made every effort to exhaust her subject is evident not only in the course of its treatment but also in the valuable appendices in which she lists first, the editions of Old French texts published between 1820 and 1860; second, the critical material dealing with Old French literature published between 1820 and 1860; third, reviews of editions of Old French texts published between 1820 and 1840. In each list there appear also certain works published before 1820, included "as a matter of convenience." It would seem more fitting, since they appear in the body of the thesis, to place them together with other works of reference in a bibliography, which is notable by its absence. The omission of this and of an index detracts much from the usefulness of this study.

The author minimizes perhaps the mediaeval interest before 1820. We have in mind especially the works of Chateaubriand, other than the *Génie du christianisme*, in which the "culte des ruines" and chivalry bulk large and where there is some reference to mediaeval literature. Intensely interested in history, this precursor of Romanticism identifies the Gothic cathedral with the national past and evokes that past in contemplating the cathedral. In

this, he precedes both Nodier and Deschamps. The manner in which the whole subject is treated is logical and clear. If, in the course of the thesis, the frequent summaries prove somewhat too obvious and tedious, the conclusion redeems the work by its ease and naturalness. On the whole, this is an admirable addition to the studies of the Romantic period.

META HELENA MILLER

*The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina*

---

*The Staging of the "Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages" of the MS. Cangé.* By DOROTHY PENN. New York: 1933. Pp. 95. (Publications of the Institute of French Studies).

The forty plays of the MS. Cangé, in spite of their pious dénouement brought about by the often curious but timely intervention of the Virgin, belong with that very small group represented by the *Griseledis*, which shows us what might have been the characteristics of a secular theatre of romantic adventure and violent realism, had such a theatre developed in France as it did in Elizabethan England. In her recent study, Miss Penn limits herself almost entirely to an investigation of the probable staging of these plays. She does indicate, however, her opinion that the collection was probably the property of a guild which celebrated the principal fêtes of the Virgin, the Purification in February, the Annunciation in March, the Assumption in August, by the presentation in a closed hall of one of these plays. It does not seem likely that more than one or two plays were given each year, so that the collection would cover, then, the activity of thirty-five to forty years (pp. 8-9). Miss Penn offers Magnin's dating of this period, 1345-80, without comment of her own and without discussion of Roy's arguments for the extension of these dates (*Études sur le Théâtre fr. du XIV et du XV siècle*, Paris, 1902, pp. clxxxix, cxc). As for the location of this guild, there is the interesting suggestion that it was neither Senlis, Rouen, nor even Paris, but rather Boulogne. The evidence adduced for Boulogne merits greater space in the text, rather than relegation to a footnote.

After a careful analysis of the scenes indicated in each play, the author concludes that all of the plays could have been presented adequately on an indoor stage of probably forty feet in width, with the aid of a permanent "set" of not more than nine *mansions*. The setting required for the most elaborate of these plays, No. xxxvii, "is a natural growth of the first stage, which was of the same scheme but fewer *mansions*" (p. 22). Charts, as well as a study of the miniatures of the MS., help to make clear and plausible this

conclusion. A chapter on stage devices shows that, once favored by the public, the same devices and typical scenes, torture, hunting scenes, etc., kept recurring in the successive plays. Finally, Miss Penn undertakes a detailed comparison of the simplest of the *Miracles* (I) with the most elaborate and in her opinion most highly developed in dramatic technique (xxxvii) in order to prove a fundamental resemblance in construction and scenic arrangement.

Throughout the repertoire, if one studies attentively the text, the plot, the devices, and the emotional appeals of these plays, one finds fair evidence that the staging of each play was based on, or at least took cognizance of, the stage and the manner of presentation of foregoing plays (p. 56).

There are two closely related and important questions hardly touched upon in this study: what is the authorship of the plays, and are the plays now arranged in the chronological order of their composition? The evidence of varied authorship is clear and has been studied carefully by Schnell (*Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanische Philologie* xxxiii, 1885, p. 73), who is quoted by Miss Penn as she offers her own hypothesis that the collection represents the work of fifteen to twenty authors (pp. 9-10, note 26). The investigations proving varied authorship show, at the same time, that the plays cannot be now in their correct chronological relation. It is unfortunate that the author did not know the thesis of Mlle Stadler-Honegger (*Etude sur les Miracles de Notre-Dame par personnages*, Paris, 1926), where it is convincingly shown, for example, that plays iii and xiv are probably by the same author (p. 136), that the most advanced dramatic technique seems that of xii and of xxvi (p. 78). Such results should have been considered by the author before dividing the plays arbitrarily (p. 14) into three groups, i-xiv, xv-xxv, xxvi-xl, each successive group showing supposedly an increase in dramatic and scenic development.

The usefulness of this study is somewhat impaired by certain deficiencies in method. This is particularly evident in the introduction, where in her brief summary of the Old French religious drama and its staging, the author relies far too closely on such secondary and out-dated sources as Petit de Julleville, apparently unaware of the work of Karl Young and the existence in modern editions of such texts as the *Miracle de Théophile* and of the two texts so important for the history of early medieval staging, the *Représentation d'Adam* and the *Anglo-Norman Resurrection*. A more thorough acquaintance with the *mystères* would have avoided certain doubtful statements in comparing them with the *miracles* (cf. pp. 2, 3, 19, 63). Frequently, in the depicting of stage devices and scenes, we should like to know whether the author is drawing upon definite sources (cf. pp. 20, 38, etc.). Omission of editions, as notably that of *Griseledis*, etc., p. 68; of page refer-

ences (cf. pp. 7, 20), errors in the spelling of citations from the *Miracles* (cf. pp. 38, l. 850, p. 28, l. 709), are prevalent. Finally, chapter headings would have been helpful.

The following additions may be made to the author's general bibliography:

- Busch, R., *Ueber die Betheurungs- und Beschwörungsformeln in den Miracles*, Marburg, 1886.  
 Loewinski, H., *Die Lyrik in den "Miracles de Nostre Dame"*, Berlin, 1900.  
 Forkert, F., *Beiträge zu den Bildern aus dem altfranz. Volksleben auf Grund der "Miracles de Nostre Dame" par personnages*, Teil I and II; *Glaubensleben u. kirchliches Leben*, Heidelberg thesis, Bonn, 1901.  
 Lancaster, H. C., *The French Tragi-Comedy*, Baltimore, 1907.  
 Baur, A., *Beitrag zu Untersuchungen über mittelalterliche Moral auf Grund der "Miracles de Notre-Dame"*, Zurich, 1911.  
 Meyer, H., *Die Predigten in den Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages*, Berlin, 1911.  
 Wittmann, A., *Flexion in den altfr. Miracles de Nostre-Dame*, Heidelberg, 1911.  
 Axelson, A., *Supernatural beings in the French Med. Dramas, with special reference to the Miracles of the Virgin*, Copenhagen, 1924.  
 Stadler-Honegger, M., *Etude sur les Miracles de Notre-Dame par personnages*, Zurich thesis, Paris, 1926.

On the whole, Miss Penn has done a serious and interesting piece of work. Her study contributes to our knowledge of the medieval theatre by showing how definitely one type of stage setting prevailed, a limited number of *mansions* of conventional structure, a palace, the sea, an inn, whether the players were representing the secular *miracle* of the *Marquise de la Gaudine* in a closed hall, or the *Mystère de la Passion* in the open square before the church.

JEAN GRAY WRIGHT

Westhampton College

Hartmann von Aue. *Studien zu einer Biographie*. Von H. SPARNAAY. Erster Band. Halle: Niemeyer, 1932. Pp. v, 179.

Hartmann, owing to the clarity of his style and his general literary excellence, has always been a favorite object of investigators, both mature and immature. A general summary of the results obtained by Sparnaay and his predecessors was greatly to be desired; such is offered by the work under consideration. The opening chapter treats of the facts of Hartmann's life as far as anything can be surmised about them. Switzerland, largely for linguistic reasons, is declared to be his home. A second chapter treats of the chronological sequence of the works and a third of the *Lieder* and *Büchlein*. In reference to the sequence of the works Sparnaay holds that this can only be determined by the progress of Hartmann's art in handling his material. He regrets in this connection the lack of investigations on style and language of the epic of the

pre-classical period considered as models for the early Hartmann, who never ceased to perfect his art. A study of select words and the rhymes, to a less degree of the syntax and related aspects would seem to suggest the sequence: *Gregor*, *Arme Heinrich*, and *Iwein*, *Erec* being separated from *Gregor* by a gap. This simply confirms the order of Hartmann's works already established by Lachmann (1793-1851), a proof of the high grade of German scholarship at an early period. Sparnaay inclines to place the *Büchlein* before *Erec*. In the third chapter he declares impossible any attempt to determine the sequence of the *Lieder*. For the *Büchlein* Sparnaay is inclined to assume a French rather than a Provencal source. The 'Schlussgedicht' (*Büchlein*, v. 1645-1914), he considers to be by Hartmann. In a fourth chapter he treats *Erec*, a tale of a knight who neglected his knightly duties and put his wife to a severe test. Sparnaay concludes that Hartmann was undoubtedly acquainted with the *Erec* of Chrestien de Troyes, but he recognizes other strains of influence represented for us by the *Mabinogion* and the Norse *Ereksaga*. For the final discussion of Hartmann's art the reader is referred to the second volume, which will also treat the *Arme Heinrich* and the *Iwein*. But we may not leave the subject of the *Erec* without stressing the sustained interest with which the author handles the involved problems of the *Erec* story. The last topic treated in the volume under discussion is Hartmann's *Gregorius*, based on a French original, a story of conscious and unconscious sin and salvation through God's great forgiveness. Sparnaay would like to link up the main story with the tale of Dârâb in the *Schachnâme* of the Persian poet Firdusi, such influence being quite possible in the period of the Crusades. This matter he believes to have been expanded by influence of the Greek legend of Saint Martinian, like Gregorius a penitent confined on a lonely island and eventually elevated to the dignity of the papacy. There are also contacts with the Arthurian cycle (cf. the summary, p. 179).

It is to be regretted that Sparnaay could not make use of Sievers' article: *Zur inneren und äusseren Chronologie der Werke Hartmanns von Aue* in: *Festgabe Philipp Strauch*, Halle, 1932. It may not have been available to him at the time his book was being published. Sievers arranges the *Lieder* by means of his 'Querindex' and the type of sound production in two consecutive series. The *Kreuzlieder* conclude the second series. Hartmann is recognized to be Swiss. *Minnesangs Frühling*, 217, 14 and 212, 37 are not by Hartmann, the former being Bavarian, the latter Middle German. This is of importance, far reaching conclusions having been drawn in reference to Hartmann's life from *M. F.*, 217, 24, which is not Alemannic. Sievers' opinion seems to this reviewer incontrovertible. To *Erec* is assigned a place before the oldest *Lied*. The *Büchlein* takes its place between *Lied* 3 and 4. The

*Anhang* of *Büchlein* (v. 1645-1914) is not by Hartmann. *Iwein* closes the series of Hartmann's works. The *Gregorius* and *Arme Heinrich* possess a complicated structure, large sections having been revised or intercalated by the poet at a later date. These passages constitute about 34% of the *Gregorius* and 42% of the *Arme Heinrich*. How far they are newly added or merely recast is a question by itself. The revision of the *Arme Heinrich* follows almost immediately after that of the *Gregorius*. The older versions of these poems are placed in chronological sequence between *Lied* 8 and 9. The later additions, over against the simple piety of the original form, are marked by excessive religious moralizing. The much discussed passage *M. F.*, 218, 19:

und lebt mîn herre,  
Salatîn und al sîn her, dien bræhten mich  
von Franchen niemer einen fuoz!

is established in the form indicated by the comma after *her*, referring to Saladin († 1193) as still living. In consequence the crusade referred to must have been that of Friedrich Barbarossa A.D. 1189, not that of 1197.

The present reviewer is convinced that Sievers' determinations by 'Schallanalyse' excel in importance and reliability any results obtained by other methods. The greater definiteness of Sievers' statements can be seen by comparing them with those of Sparnaay. This is not to say that the traditional methods of research are displaced by 'Schallanalyse,' which covers only a well defined field. It would however seem rational for all investigators to take note of any results obtained by Sievers in German, in English, in Romance or other languages, and to determine how far they seem to agree with the results by different methods.

To sum up Sparnaay's work it must be characterized as extremely conscientious, holding an equal balance between his own opinions and those of others.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

*New York University*

*William Bartram, Interpreter of the American Landscape.* By N. BRYLLION FAGIN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 229. \$2.25.

The naturalist William Bartram (1739-1823) of Philadelphia was an interesting man in himself and in what he did or indirectly effected; his influence was considerable abroad as well as in America. A good many scattered articles have been published concerning him and his father, John Bartram, the self-taught botanist and well-known founder of a botanic garden; and there are many references to both men in books of their own time and since. William certainly

deserved a book about him, and Dr. Fagin by way of a dissertation has produced a very useful book, to which any one who desires full information on its subject from now on must turn; there will be no need of another book on William Bartram.

This volume is divided into three Parts and a Conclusion, with a brief Appendix, a Bibliography of ten pages, and an Index of thirteen, superadded. Part I contains three chapters, on Bartram's Life and Character, his Philosophy of Nature, and his Studies of the American Indian; Part II, two chapters, on the Elements of Bartram's Landscape, and his Art. Part III is not divided into chapters, but takes up the literary influence of Bartram on Coleridge, Wordsworth, Southey, Bowles, Campbell, Mrs. Hemans, Lamb, Shelley, Tennyson, and Carlyle; on Emerson, Thoreau, Chivers, and Hearn; and on Chateaubriand and other Continental writers. The influence of Bartram on Wordsworth and Coleridge has been exploited heretofore, by Ernest Hartley Coleridge and the present writer, and, among others, recently by Lowes. There was more left to do in following it through lesser or later English and American poets. The special value of Dr. Fagin's work seems to lie in these minor researches, and in his account of Bartram's life. The laudatory references to Bartram that are here collected I also commend to the reader, along with the parallel passages from Bartram's *Travels* and the writings they influenced. Documentary evidence is precisely supplied.

If there is anything yet definitely wanting, it is a study of Continental influence upon Bartram, and of his influence upon Continental writers apart from Chateaubriand; the adaptations by Chateaubriand from Bartram's *Travels* have long been known. This study of Continental writers, of their debt, that is, to Bartram, Dr. Fagin (p. 198) has left to some successor—who may well confine himself to an article or articles, without attempting a doctoral dissertation on the subject.

It is hardly fair to label Bartram, as Dr. Fagin does, an interpreter of *the* American landscape. Any reader of Wordsworth's *Ruth* and of his lines to Hartley Coleridge at the age of six will see the difference in effect on the same poet of two kinds of American landscape, as reported by Carver in the region of the Great Lakes and by Bartram in Georgia. Obviously Wordsworth's eye was caught by Bartram's exuberant account of the flowers that 'set the hills on fire'; it is not so obvious, but it can be shown, that Wordsworth did not altogether like the exuberance. At all events the landscape Bartram tells of is only one among a number in North America, and more akin to things which Tennyson might approve, but which left Wordsworth now and then uneasy. Dr. Fagin (p. 190) repeats the story told by Aubrey de Vere of a meeting between Tennyson and the elderly Wordsworth in which the younger man became enthusiastic over 'a tropical island where the

trees, when they first [came] into leaf, were a vivid scarlet, every one of them . . . one flush . . . the color of blood.'—I mention the unnoticed parallel with one of the islands in Tennyson's *Voyage of Maeldune*.—Tennyson complained that he had failed to arouse any enthusiasm in Wordsworth for the island. 'The old poet,' according to the story, may have recalled the scarlet flowers in *Ruth*, and did not need 'to glow' a second time. The truth is, however, that there is in Wordsworth at first hand nothing of the Asian or exotic style. It is the dubious hero of *Ruth* into whose seductive speeches Wordsworth introduced the exuberance of Bartram. Dr. Fagin's work is painstaking and full, but lacks something in the finer aspects of interpretation; he overestimates the excellence of the *Travels*, excellent as they are, and cannot see the deficiencies of its writer for the virtues. He is good enough to think well of my discoveries of parallels with Bartram, but not ready to accept what I thought best in my discussion of them, my insistence on the criticism involved in Wordsworth's use of books of travel and the want of criticism by Coleridge in his use of them.

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

---

*Sheridan Knowles and the Theatre of his Time.* By LESLIE HOWARD MEEKS. Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press, 1933. xii + 240 pp. \$3.25.

A spirited, entertaining, well-written, and informative feature of this book is Chapter VII, "In America." Otherwise, *Sheridan Knowles* is commonplace, chiefly because Mr. Meeks devotes most of his time to the internals of Knowles's empty stuff and consequently adds little to what was already understood. The inevitable conclusion is that Knowles and his plays, though they "acted" and were admired, were "perhaps one part genius and three parts sheer twaddle." Somehow in the vain search for lasting qualities in Knowles, Mr. Meeks never discovers his significance in the theatre of his time. Chapter I, "The Setting," is decidedly the least adequate. The story of the 19th-century theatre is not a list of otherwise great men who failed to write great acting drama for a variety of reasons, but a series of movements, the slow currents of which were stirred chiefly by competent actors, directors, and playwrights. For example, explicitly and implicitly Mr. Meeks calls Knowles a domestic dramatist (pp. 74, 75, 78, 84-5, 107, 129), but nowhere does he discuss domestic dramas. Yet they were numerous enough before 1843 to constitute a school and they were important for three main reasons: (1) they acquired peculiar emphases, indicative of *zeitgeist*, which distinguished them from



earlier examples of the genre; (2) they were written by important persons like Browning, as in *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon*; and (3) they helped with other genres to bring romantic tragedy down to earth and to the tragic comedy of common human relationships, a sense of social responsibility, and a knowledge of society as a determinant in human behavior. Knowles was the purest of domestic dramatists. The genre suited his temperament, as his American speeches show. He was also the first to dignify the "new" school with literacy, a "Shakespearean" elegance which it had lacked in the hands of Jerrold, its boastful father, and which appealed to the cultured as it appealed to Andrew Jackson or James O'Neill. In the movement of theatrical ideas, Knowles is significant because he wrote domestic drama and because, for whatever reason, few others of his time wrote anything better. There is even something to be said for the "realism" of a drama in which sentiments, rather than persons or ideas, conflict. For though in it no respectable sentiment can triumph over another without shocking the audience and turning the play into a thesis-drama; though the dramatist has therefore to resort to artifices like a new-found, long-lost family for a dénouement; and though in specific actual cases one sentiment invariably defeats a conflicting sentiment—in spite of all these conditions, sentiments, however often they conflict, by some trickery do survive forever in reality.<sup>1</sup>

ARTHUR E. DuBOIS

Baltimore, Maryland

---

<sup>1</sup> When in *The Hunchback* or *The Secretary* or Bulwer's *Lady of Lyons*, love (a sentiment, not a passion) conflicts with filial respect or with caste-pride, only a sudden elevation of the objectionable hero or heroine can effect a proper dénouement. In *A Woman killed with Kindness*, similarly, Heywood is forced to resort to the strawberry-mark device, for he may not make Frankford kill Anne since that would violate the sentiment of triumphant natural love and he may not allow Anne to have loved with impunity outside the marriage-bond, and so he slithers between the alternatives and makes Anne mortally consumptive. Knowles's *Virginus* is invariably misjudged because it is never examined by the standards of its genre. Virginus's duty is to avenge with death a dishonored daughter, but he ought not to kill even a villain and, if he does, he ought not to commit suicide even to escape the consequences. Accordingly, Knowles makes him mad and explains in an "Author's Preface" that this madness "gives the catastrophe the air of a visitation of Providence"—it is not a blunder in character study or in plot management but a characteristic domestic-dramatic trick. Mr. Meeks, incidentally, calls *The Wife* (p. 117) a thesis-play. The thesis is that of *Comus*, that virtue and innocence always triumph against appearances!

*The Orient in American Transcendentalism, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott.* By ARTHUR CHRISTY. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. xix + 382. \$4.00.

Mr. Christy's book is interesting as being the second publication within a brief time on the theme of the Oriental influence upon the transcendentalists, the preceding one being Frederick I. Carpenter's *Emerson and Asia*. They are worthy of remark in the mere fact that they serve to break down in some slight degree the occidental provincialism which makes almost all study of European and American culture proceed on the tacit assumption that world culture is bounded on the east by Athens, on the west by San Francisco, on the south by the Mediterranean and the Gulf of Mexico, and on the north by the Arctic Ocean. It would be wholesome to have a prolonged continuation of these studies which would throw into their proper perspective the relationship between the culture of the old east and that of the new west.

Mr. Christy's work proceeds two steps further than Mr. Carpenter's in progressing from Emerson to Thoreau and Alcott and in giving an introductory statement which indicates both the extent and the limitations of western consciousness and western obligations. The volume at hand is also commendable on account of its attempt not merely to accumulate data, but to arrive at interpretative conclusions which in literary studies are the only justification for the amassing of facts.

The book, however, has its shortcomings, the author's reach far surpassing his grasp. As far as the Emersonian section goes, Mr. Christy, in perhaps a laudable attempt not to duplicate Carpenter's work, abandons the most valuable feature of *Emerson and Asia*, which was the approach to the subject in terms of the progressive steps of consciousness of, knowledge of, allusion to, quotation from, and assimilation of Oriental concepts. And there is an apparent dissatisfaction with the results in this longest section of the book in changing to another method with Thoreau and Alcott, on the ground that to pursue the methods with these "would lead to monotonous repetition and to anti-climax." It is a just observation and is what it did lead to in the Emerson section.

Other defects may perhaps arise from a degree of immaturity in the author-critic. He inclines to assign every likeness between the Concordians and the Oriental classics as a matter of indebtedness, in spite of the fact that often they could be accounted for in terms of the character and temperament of the American writers. He inclines in the fashion of Biblical exegesis toward a literal interpretation of poetic utterances. In the interests of his case he tends to make much of confirmatory data and to discount the data on the other side of the question.

One of the best observations in the whole volume is contained in

the concluding brief section in which the conflict between the Puritan and the Oriental is expounded, and the result of these in the Concord group is implied. The book has a great deal of significant data distributed through it and can be valuable largely in proportion to the informed discrimination of the reader. A seasoned student can cull and interpret much that is presented there. An uninitiated one might be somewhat misled by it.

PERCY H. BOYNTON

*University of Chicago*

*Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame.* By CLYDE KENNETH HYDER. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 388. \$3.50.

I have a particular and personal interest, in fact a two-fold interest, in Dr. Hyder's monograph. He has done for the history of Swinburne's reputation in England what ten years ago I attempted to do for Byron's. And he has made considerable use of my own book on Swinburne, which he commends in courteous and gratifying terms. It is natural, therefore, for me to read his book to some extent at least by my own light. No such enormous mass of criticism and commentary has grown up around Swinburne's "fame and after-fame" as around Byron's, partly because of a much briefer lapse of time, partly because he is a much less significant figure. In consequence, where my problem was one of condensation and selection (my own card-index of Byroniana contains more than twice as many items as are given in the bibliography which I printed), his has been to include, if possible, practically every reference to Swinburne, including the ephemerality of the comic journals (which, by the way, are not insignificant since they reflect current opinion and taste). I have noted but two omissions of consequence: a bitter attack upon the poet by Miss Marie Corelli (who, like the comic journals, reflected the taste of a very large public) and a thoughtful estimate in Masterman's too-soon-forgotten volume "In Peril of Change," published not long before Swinburne's death. Dr. Hyder has further swelled his volume by including a subject for which, in the case of Byron, I found there was scarcely any room: the poet's reactions to the criticism of his work. In this sense, not in the sense that a new narrative of his literary life is offered, the words of his title—"Literary Career"—are intended. This portion of his subject involves the repetition of a good deal of old controversial matter; the elaborate accounts of Swinburne's quarrels, though they could not be omitted, might have been condensed.

Dr. Hyder rightly distinguishes three phases through which

Swinburne's reputation passed in his own life-time. He was the poet of blasphemy, the poet of erotic passion, and (at a somewhat later date) the poet of Republicanism. In the opinion of many contemporaries he was most "dangerous" in this last rôle. I wish that Dr. Hyder had elaborated some suggestions given in my *Swinburne* and had set the republican poet against the background of republican sentiment which was extraordinarily vocal in England in the early eighteen-seventies. During the last decades of his life and since his death Swinburne's significance as the poet of liberty has, as Dr. Hyder remarks, to some extent overshadowed his notoriety as the poet of passion. The once-celebrated lilies of vice have sadly wilted; but there are still those who await a political sunrise—even though they have neither the genius nor the confidence to sing about it.

The innumerable details of the monograph have been so carefully checked and rechecked that there is little to be said except by way of commendation. Dr. Hyder hints a disagreement with me regarding Watts-Dunton's influence upon Swinburne during the long years at Putney. But it seems reasonable to suppose that the man who could cure Swinburne of brandy-drinking could do a good deal towards the moulding of his opinions. In particular, it was not an "assumption" on my part (see page 287) that Watts-Dunton encouraged Swinburne's attacks upon Lord Lytton ("Owen Meredith"). I had the story from Lytton's intimate friend, the late Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. It is true that the parody of Lytton's style was composed long before the "Putney Period"; but it was not published till then. This, however, is a small matter. The monograph may be unreservedly commended as an admirable example of what has always seemed to me an interesting and important kind of literary inquiry. The notes are abundant and rich in entertaining details. The bibliography is invaluable.

S. C. CHEW

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray.* With Introduction and Notes, by the Late ERNEST HAROLD PEARCE, Bishop of Worcester. Edited with Additional Notes by LEONARD WHIBLEY. Cambridge, University Press, 1932. Pp. xxxi + 179. 10 sh. 6 d.

Fifty-nine letters—thirty-five from Hurd to Mason, nineteen from Mason to Hurd, and five from Hurd to Gray—from the collection at Hartlebury, the seat of the Worcester diocese, over which Hurd presided tell the story of the life-long friendship of Hurd

and Mason. Hurd appears frequently in the rôle of critic. Constructive suggestions for the improvement of *Caractacus* and the *Religio Laici*, encouragement to complete "Il Bellicoso" and "Il Pacifico" and to resume work on the *English Garden*, praise of everything Mason wrote—praise that is sometimes sound and sometimes indiscriminate and even absurd: all this and more, Hurd, the critic, offers his friend Mason, the poet. But Hurd was Mason's adviser, confidant, and comforter as well. When "Il Bellicoso" and "Il Pacifico" fail to receive the public approval that Hurd had predicted for them, he assures the poet that the "bad taste of the public" must be blamed. When Mason is discouraged by his failure to receive promotion, Hurd consoles him with the thought that Heaven "has given us what no fortune could have done, the love and friendship of each other."

Mason, it appears, held a unique place in Hurd's affections. The latter, during his long life of eighty-eight years, admitted no more than a half dozen persons to his intimate circle. He "never wore his heart on his sleeve," and his natural reserve and distrust of any emotional display generally exclude the intimate passages we might expect in a correspondence with close friends. Only in the letters to Mason do we discover a warmth of affection and, what is quite as unusual, an absence of formality and reserve. In the Hurd-Mason correspondence, therefore, we have, for the first time, an opportunity to meet a completely human Richard Hurd, very different from the prim, precise little bishop, cold and supercilious, that his contemporaries have pictured to us and that his biographer Kilvert has been only partially successful in altering.

Aside from the interesting light that it throws on the relations between the two men this collection of letters has little to offer. Personal matters are the chief concern of the writers. The correspondence does not help us to a better understanding of the eighteenth century or its leading figures. The introduction is of value chiefly in accounting for the temporary breach in the friendship of Hurd and Mason. Directly and indirectly it also suggests the wealth of material which the archives at Hartlebury hold for whoever shall give us a modern study of the life and works of Richard Hurd.

AUDLEY L. SMITH

*The George Washington University*

---

*The Versification of Thomas Hardy.* By ELIZABETH CATHCART HICKSON. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931. Pp. 129.

Here is a thorough-going analysis of the verse forms used in the two thousand and more poems in Thomas Hardy's collected works

The statistical analysis is complete, stresses, rhythms, rimes, stanzas, figures of speech, assonances, alliterations, everything is here reduced to tabular form. And though a captious critic might undertake an examination of a few of the studies, and not always find himself in agreement with the findings—for example it is always easy to redistribute stresses and find an ever increasing number of variations in dominant verse patterns—the study is an admirable piece of diligent and even resourceful research. And yet one pauses—it is unfair to compare it with the excellent study that the poet Bridges made of the poet Milton. The one is looking for the secret of the aural charm of poetry, the other is making a table of statistics. One ought to be forbidden to carry these things too far. They show the enormous amount of capital punishment graduate students can take in the preparation of their dissertations.

The poetry of most convincing poets is architectural. It was not necessary for Thomas Hardy to have had his training in architecture to discover this generalization. Goethe said it long before Hardy; and the Greeks practiced it long before the architects designed the Parthenon. But in this architectural design of a successful poem there are many elusive elements—but none the less real—that never can be reduced into any tabulation or shown by the analysis of statistics. I refer to tone, pitch, and even the elusiveness of the pause and its relative duration, the question of tempo,—these are felt by the reader, and as in music are matters of interpretation on which all will not be agreed.

As a result one looks in vain here for any generalizations which will give much help to a better understanding of the essential thing—the aural charm of the verse of Thomas Hardy. The less austere method of Robert Bridges succeeded much more nearly in doing precisely what the poet-critic wanted—giving a clue how Milton ought to be read, and enjoyed in the reading.

PHILO M. BUCK, JR.

*University of Wisconsin*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*Vorträge 1930/1931: England und die Antike.* Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg, herausgegeben von FRITZ SAXL, Band IX. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1932. Pp. 304, with 30 plates. The Bibliothek Warburg was founded a generation ago in Hamburg to serve as a centre for the study of the influence of Classical culture on modern civilization. It has already published more than twenty monographs, some of them of first importance, and we have before us the ninth volume of lectures, delivered by nine English

and German scholars during the winter of 1930-31, on the general subject of Ancient culture in England. As might be expected, the volume is neither a treatise nor a history; the lectures are mainly of a monographic and specialized nature and have little connection beyond the common theme. Three lecturers chose subjects of considerable scope: E. F. Jacob, on "Some aspects of classical influence in Mediaeval England"; Walter F. Schirmer, on "Chaucer, Shakespeare und die Antike"; and Sir Richard W. Livingstone, on "The position and function of classical studies in modern English education." The essay by Livingstone is of great interest to anyone concerned with the problem of humanistic education in our time. Hans Liebeschütz, discussing "Der Sinn des Wissens bei Roger Bacon," denies the modernity of Bacon's thought. J. A. K. Thomson, who published a book on *Irony* a few years ago, contributes a paper on "Erasmus in England," in which his contention is, to quote his own words, "that the great contribution of Erasmus to European culture is this that he brought back irony into literature. And I would add that he did it in conjunction with Sir Thomas More." Such a thesis is provocative but the author makes out a good case. Oskar Fischel discusses "Inigo Jones und der Theaterstil der Renaissance," particularly of course with reference to modifications of Classical artistic traditions. E. Cassirer, in "Shaftesbury und die Renaissance des Platonismus in England," contends that through Shaftesbury the spirit of Plato was diffused through modern culture in Europe. While this contention is indubitably true, Cassirer's account needs a good deal of supplementing; in the first place, the philosophy of Plato reached the modern world by other avenues than Shaftesbury; in the second place, the philosophy of Shaftesbury was far from being a pure Platonism and was derived from a great variety of sources; and finally, it may very well be argued that the elements in Shaftesbury which gained the greatest popularity and influence were not strictly Platonic. Cassirer's pattern of the history of thought is too simple and schematic. The same criticism applies to the essay by Edgar Wind on "Humanitätsidee und heroisiertes Porträt in der englischen Kultur des 18. Jahrhunderts." Wind associates by a circuitous argument the philosophy of Hume and the painting of Gainsborough: Reynolds belongs to the circle of Johnson and shares the philosophy of Beattie; but Reynolds and Gainsborough were rivals in painting, just as Beattie was a critic of the philosophy of Hume; therefore by a sort of geometrical necessity the art of Gainsborough finds itself ranged alongside the sceptical philosophy of Hume. Such generalizations and plausible syntheses are the peculiar danger and temptation of "geistesgeschichte." In conclusion mention should be made of the characteristic essay on "Classicism and romanticism in the poetry of Walter Savage

Landor" by E. de Selincourt, whose scholarship is never wayward and whose criticism is a delight.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

*University of Michigan*

---

*The Rule of Health.* By JOHN GHESEL. Edited by H. T. Price. Pp. iv + [24]; *A Special Help to Orthographie.* By RICHARD HODGES. Edited by C. C. F. Pp. xiv + 30; *The Art of Limming.* Edited by C. E. P. Pp. iv + 26. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1932. (Michigan Facsimile Series, 1, 2, 3.) These are the first of some two or three hundred facsimiles of 16th- and 17th-century rare books to be issued at the rate of approximately one a month. If the initial numbers are a fair sample, the series will enable libraries and individuals to fill in gaps with rather usable facsimiles of works of considerable interest to the student—works absent from many American libraries. One defect, however, should be noted. The process of reproduction has unfortunately caused a thickening of some of the letters, obliterating such differences, clear in the original, as those between italicized *h* and *b*, *c* and *e*. Occasionally this is a deterrent, even to the eye accustomed to 16th- and 17th-century fonts. Retouching probably accounts for the fact that in *The Art of Limming*, sig. A.ij. appears in the facsimile as A.y. Such defects render the volumes of less use than reproductions done by a more elaborate process. But the elaborate process costs money. Edwards Brothers have done well in making available at low cost reproductions which will serve the purpose of most readers.

W. LEE USTICK

*The Henry E. Huntington Library*

---

*The Gloomy Egoist.* By ELEANOR M. SICKELS. New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. xvi + 408. \$4.75. In this study of the tradition of melancholy as it worked out in the poetry of Great Britain between 1740 and 1830, Miss Sickels has done all that could be expected to render interesting a tangled story, often told before from other points of view, which involves much citation of third-rate literature and reaches no conclusions not already familiar. Perhaps because she knows too well the tedium of most doctoral dissertations, or perhaps because the spectacle of melancholy in others is somehow enspiriting to the beholder, she does not avoid, in her first chapters, a suggestion of flippancy, and her book is nowhere deeply thoughtful. Her treatment of the greater romantic poets is respectful, but she does not respect their melancholy, feeling that it was in some degree an inherited fashion. She thinks that it is not always easy to tell how much of a poet's melancholy is due to literary fashions and to the philosophical ideas



of his day, and how much "to the state of his digestion, the encroachments of tuberculosis, the disposition of his grandfather, or the importunities of his creditors." The possibility that it may have a sound basis in a wise man's view of life as it is does not often occur to her, at any rate in her discussion of the lesser figures of the eighteenth century. Until she comes to Byron, Shelley, and Keats, her frequent innuendo hints that in her opinion melancholy is faintly ludicrous. Miss Sickels has done valuable work in her analysis of "melancholy" into several of its main ingredients, of which "solitude" was perhaps the chief. Continuing the research recorded in Professor Amy Reed's *The Background of Gray's Elegy*, she has made, as a matter of course, extensive use of *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, by Professor R. D. Havens. Her reading is wide, and the modest conclusions announced in her last chapter are established. Considering the known rules of the game, perhaps she is not to be blamed for having merely skimmed the surface of her subject. If she has not wrestled with its more difficult problems, has not tried to place herself imaginatively inside the lives of the two or three hundred "melancholy" poets whom she enumerates with adequate erudition and perhaps an occasional excess of gaiety, she has at any rate assembled many titles on her thread of narrative and has written seventy-five pages of interesting and readable notes.

ODELL SHEPARD

*Trinity College*

---

*A Johnson Handbook.* By MILDRED C. STRUBLE. New York: Crofts, 1933. Pp. xii + 354. \$2.00. The purpose of this book is "to offer, in as compact a format as is feasible, a compendium of the salient data concerning the life, the character, and the principal works of this tremendous man." The first two chapters discuss Johnson's biographers and Johnson the man. Successive chapters are devoted to an exposition of his works, which, for previous want of such a manual perhaps, have been more often praised than read. Seven full-page portraits and photographs illustrate the text.

A handbook to the study of Johnson has long been needed, but the present work seems less a handbook than a series of essays, which for the most part are somewhat chatty and embroidered with exclamation points. Many facts are given, but more synthesis is needed. The Johnsonian may also wish that the author had been less superficial, as, for example, in levying unduly upon the Doctor's defective sense faculties to account for his "stark insensibility" to what moderns call poetic excellence. At least a chapter on neo-classicism, in which Johnson's critical theory is rooted, is necessary fully to explain his critical vagaries.

Of value to students is the chapter on "Miscellaneous Works,"

which contains matter not generally known or easily accessible. A brief but well chosen bibliography concludes this Johnson handbook, the use of which will require sound classroom guidance if the student is to arrive at a just appraisal of the "brightest ornament" of his century.

ROBERT KILBOURNE

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Pope, Poetry and Prose. With Essays by Johnson, Coleridge, Hazlitt, etc.* With an Introduction and Notes by H. V. D. DYSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. xviii + 188. \$1.25. This volume of selections should be attractive and useful to such instructors as do not dislike having many secondary works represented by brief fragments. It is well produced from the standpoint both of printing and of editing. The Introduction possibly exaggerates the effect of poverty on Pope's career: it was his aristocratic way of life and not his actual poverty that made him desire to make money. In general the factual and interpretative comment is excellent. A notable exception is the treatment of the *Essay on Man* (p. xiii), which is almost silly. Granted that the poem does not present a coherent "system," still it is aesthetically noble, philosophically interesting, and historically very important. How one can get an adequate knowledge of Pope or of his century by reading only a fragment of this poem is a mystery. It is said that Pope was too ignorant to write such a work; but how many writers in whatever language have written more significant philosophical poems?

GEORGE SHERBURN

*The University of Chicago*

---

*La Poesia di Shelley.* By MICHELE RENZULLI. Rome: Campitelli, 1932. Pp. iv + 450. L. 20. Close students of Shelley will find in this book few statements of fact and few ideas of interpretation that are not already familiar. Professor Renzulli's closest approach to "original contribution" will be found in his fully corroborated assertion that the Gothic macabresque was a main item among the influences playing upon Shelley's mind and also among the effects of his poetry. The discussion of Shelley's approach to pantheistic mysticism is equally fresh and cogent. For English readers, however, the value of the book does not lie so much in these things as in the tone of restrained and well-informed enthusiasm that pervades it. The author's admiration of Shelley, as man and poet, is almost unqualified and is unreservedly expressed—often with an eloquence to which the readers of English criticism and books of literary scholarship are unaccustomed. Shelley's more important poems are translated in whole or part into Italian prose,

and at least one of these translations—that of *The Cloud*—has an independent beauty of its own. Those to whom the original poems are familiar will find these versions not uninteresting, because they show that far more than one had supposed of the effects peculiar to Shelley's style can be conveyed without the music of his verse. Professor Renzulli has shown his knowledge of English not only in the accuracy of these translations but in the precision of his remarks about Shelley's poetic style. He knows the literature of his topic thoroughly well, and his book is everywhere thoughtful and judicious without being anywhere cold or dull. Considering it as a whole, one may call it impassioned criticism. After paying his respects to Benedetto Croce and writing what sounds to American ears like a violent attack upon Papini, the author lays down in his Introduction a few critical principles from which he never departs in the body of his work. It is too much to hope that the thousands of students of English literature who are still struggling with the Teutonic incubus will learn from this book how to be at once learned and vivacious. At any rate, it should help many Italians to close sympathetic acquaintance with the great English poet who lived and died in their country.

ODELL SHEPARD

Trinity College

---

*Washington Irving and the Storrows. Letters from England and the Continent, 1821-1828.* Edited by STANLEY T. WILLIAMS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. 136. \$2.00. Irving's letters to his Paris banker, Thomas Wentworth Storrow, his wife, two daughters ("the princesses"), and son, cover the period from the publication of *Bracebridge Hall* (1822) to that of *The Conquest of Granada* (1829). As he was on friendly terms with the entire family, he reveals many sides of his life and character, from his financial pressure and hard literary work to the incidents of his travels, his friendships, and his love of ghosts and goblins. The focus of interest in the collection, however, is the light which it throws on his turn from essayist to historian with *The Life and Voyages of Columbus*. He gives a full account of his work and worries in the library of Obadiah Rich, bibliophile and American Consul at Madrid, and of his efforts to reconcile the romantic taste of his public with his new desire to write "dry" books, and his own taste for glamour with the responsibility for accuracy which the work demanded. These conflicts provide a key to his character and to his literary work.

The letters form a part of that accumulation of source material which Mr. Williams has been publishing from time to time in anticipation of his prospective biography. They exhibit his usual care for textual accuracy and completeness.

ROBERT E. SPILLER

Swarthmore College

*Walt Whitman and the Civil War.* By CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. Pp. 201. This carefully arranged collection of Whitman material makes available in convenient form a number of hitherto unknown newspaper articles, a group of letters, several first drafts of poems, and many manuscript notes from diaries and other papers in the Harned Collection of the Library of Congress and the private library of Mr. Oscar Lion. It also contains a list of the hospital cases in which the poet interested himself, a few "literary jottings," and a list of some of the newspaper clippings which served as sources for *Specimen Days*. The brief introduction and notes are competent; and the gleanings of original material are of particular value in the additional light which they cast on Whitman's career during the years 1862-5.

LEON HOWARD

*Pomona College*

---

*Essays and Characters: Montaigne to Goldsmith.* Pp. xxvi + 622. \$2.25. *Essays and Characters: Lamb to Thompson.* Pp. xxviii + 784. \$2.75. New York: Macmillan, 1933. Edited by ROBERT WITHINGTON. In these two attractively printed and bound volumes Mr. Withington provides for class use a representative collection of personal essays and characters. Much of the older material is now readily available for the first time. The nature and importance of the character might well have been stressed, for this *genre* has been generally neglected. And it is unfortunate that Breton, Howell, and Cowley could not be included. The authors—all English except Montaigne, who is given in Florio's translation—and selections illustrate adequately the development of the informal essay, but the editor deliberately leaves to teacher and student much of the task—and pleasure—of annotation and of tracing literary relationships.

JAMES G. MCMANAWAY

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Dante's Inferno.* With a translation into English triple rhyme by LAURENCE BINYON. London and New York: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. ix + 401. \$3.00. Mr. Binyon's volume prints the English and the Italian text of the *Inferno* on opposite pages. It is without notes, but in the argument prefixed to each canto he inserts brief bits of commentary. The distinctive feature of his translation is its frequent use of elision, by which he seeks to imitate more accurately the movement of the original, where so much of it occurs. But the trouble is that, in English, elision is comparatively unfamiliar and does not follow fixed rules. In Mr. Binyon's

terza rima the metre requires it in some places and forbids it in others, and he also has many anapests where elision is not involved; hence care is needed if lines are not to be misread at first sight.

Mr. Binyon's *Inferno* is a slightly freer version than some of the other rhymed ones, and seems to catch Dante's mental and phrasal manner less well than it might. It renders not a few passages deftly, and contains some really notable lines; but a large part of it is undistinguished, and in general it lacks finish, as witness numerous flaws of detail. Such flaws are often found in translations; but from Mr. Binyon, a true poet in his own right, one expects better workmanship. It would appear that as a translator he, like many eminent poets before him, is too easily satisfied.

LACY LOCKERT

Nashville, Tennessee

*Joseph Warton's Essay on Pope, A History of the Five Editions.* By WILLIAM DARNALL MACCLINTOCK. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933. Pp. x + 74. \$2.00. Professor MacClintock's forty-year interest in Warton's *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope* finds partial expression in this brochure. In three chapters he discusses the origin, significance, and reception of the *Essay*; a history of the five editions of it; and a summary of the changes from edition to edition; and in an appendix he gives a brief biographical sketch, a list of Warton's works, and a bibliographical note. There are ten full-page reproductions of title pages. Warton's *Essay*, of which Vol. I was published in 1756 and Vol. II in 1782 (along with the fourth edition of Vol. I), is an important book of the eighteenth century, whether regarded as a symptom or as an influence in the passage from "Classicism" to "Romanticism." Its core or thesis "is the principle that if a writer has the natural gift of moral or satirical poetry, he 'will never succeed, with equal merit, in the higher branches of his art'"; and Warton's purpose is to prove that Pope cannot be ranked among the greatest of poets. His method and judgments met with approval in some of his readers, and encountered sharp antagonism in others. Professor MacClintock confines himself here to the history of the book itself, and does not much discuss his author's aesthetic or philosophy. He sets out a considerable mass of details of information. The account of the composition of volume II and the data on the two "issues" of the 1782 edition of it are particularly welcome.

R. H. GRIFFITH

The University of Texas

*Thomas Southerne Dramatist.* By JOHN WENDELL DODDS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 238. \$2.00. This is a useful piece of work, thoughtful, careful, and uncommonly well written. Southerne's merits are not exaggerated, but Professor Dodds is keenly alive to the importance of filling in the Restoration and early-eighteenth-century pictures with studies of the minor figures. This was particularly desirable in Southerne's case, since "the course of the eighteenth-century sentimental theatre was in no small measure directed by *The Fatal Marriage* and *Oroonoko*." It is to be hoped that Mr. Dodds will soon proceed to give us the plays, for the editing of which he is evidently well qualified.

H. S.

---

*Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* (Volume xv), edited by G. H. MAYNADIER, R. L. HAWKINS, and A. BURKHARD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. 370. This volume contains F. G. Black, "The Technique of Letter Fiction in English from 1740 to 1800"; R. P. Blake, "Georgian Secular Literature, Epic, Romantic, and Lyric (1100-1800)"; F. T. Bowers, "The Date and Composition of *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*"; A. Burkhard, "Hans Burgkmair's Work for Emperor Maximilian I"; L. H. Butterfield, "Charles Churchill and *A Fragment of an Epic Poem*"; P. H. Harris, "The Lost Chapter of Cochin's *Voyage d'Italie*: A Document of the DeLancey Collection"; C. T. Harrison, "Bacon, Hobbes, Boyle, and the Ancient Atomists"; R. L. Hawkins, "Rachel and Arsene Houssaye: Unpublished Letters"; G. Loomis, "Saint Edmund and the Lodbrok (Lothbroc) Legend"; E. J. Simmons, "A. S. Pushkin, *The Avaricious Knight*"; H. M. Smyser, "The Engulfed Lucerna of the *Pseudo-Turpin*"; T. Starck, "The German Dialogue in *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, and the Question of Authorship"; H. P. Vincent, "The Death of William Wycherley"; B. J. Whiting, "Proverbs in Certain Middle English Romances in Relation to their French Sources"; and C. B. Woods, "'Captain B——'s Play."

*Modern Plays.* Edited by S. MARION TUCKER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932. Pp. viii + 400. \$1.50. Crothers's *Mary the Third*, Milne's *The Ivory Door*, Hughes's *Hell Bent fer Heaven*, Bennett and Knoblock's *Milestones*, and O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*, with forty pages on "Theater and Drama" and thirty-four of appendices designed to promote discussion and supply information about the dramatists.

H. S.

---

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

FEBRUARY, 1935

Number 2

---

## VICTOR HUGO AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE RIGHT TO WORK

The most penetrating historians of the Second Republic agree that it was doomed from the start because of a fatal conflict among its founders. It was established, on the one hand, by moderates who sought only a political revolution, and, on the other, by radicals who dreamed of a social revolution. The latter, headed by Louis Blanc, forced themselves into the provisional government and wrung from the moderates three important concessions: the famous "guarantee of work,"<sup>1</sup> the setting up of the National Workshops, and the creation of the Commission du Luxembourg.<sup>2</sup>

It is not my intention to retrace the history of these innovations or even to analyze the attitude of Victor Hugo toward all three. Unprepared for even a political revolution—he advocated, as is well known, a regency at the outbreak of the February uprising—he was scarcely likely to favor a radical social upheaval. Logically enough, he joined with moderates and conservatives in condemning the Commission du Luxembourg and the *Ateliers nationaux*, and breathed with them a sigh of relief when the events of May and

<sup>1</sup> The following proclamation was inserted in *Le Moniteur universel* for February 26, 1848:

Le gouvernement provisoire de la République française s'engage à garantir l'existence de l'ouvrier par le travail;

Il s'engage à garantir du travail à tous les citoyens;

Il reconnaît que les ouvriers doivent s'associer entre eux pour jouir du bénéfice légitime de leur travail.

Le Gouvernement provisoire rend aux ouvriers, auxquels il appartient, le million qui va échoir de la Liste civile.

<sup>2</sup> Its official title was *Commission du gouvernement pour les travailleurs*. It sat in the Luxembourg palace, and its purpose was to study ways and means of ameliorating the lot of the workers.

June led to their demise. But concerning the "guarantee of work," an interesting problem has arisen which I wish to discuss in some detail. Before the June insurrection, Hugo remained silent on this issue. After the workers' defeat, he contributed through his paper, *L'Événement*, to the discussion.

The radicals had not given up all hope. Even after the June days they sought to have the "right to work" included in the preamble of the new constitution. The legislative committee had in fact recognized it in the original project presented to the Assembly on June 19. Then came the insurrection, and the committee rewrote the eighth paragraph of the preamble to read as follows:

La République doit protéger le citoyen dans sa personne, sa famille, sa religion, son travail, et mettre à la portée de chacun l'instruction indispensable à tous les hommes; elle doit l'assistance aux citoyens nécessiteux, soit en leur procurant du travail dans les limites de ses ressources, soit en donnant, à défaut de famille, les moyens d'exister à ceux qui sont hors d'état de travailler.<sup>3</sup>

Clearly, the radical *droit au travail* had given way to an expression of mild humanitarianism.

What was Victor Hugo's attitude on this important social question? M. de Lacretelle, describing the poet's votes in the Chamber at this time, says malevolently:

Tous sont dictés par l'esprit conservateur le plus étroit; dans les questions ouvrières et démocratiques, il vote contre l'inscription du droit au travail dans la constitution, et il maintient cette position lorsque Félix Pyat s'efforce une dernière fois de faire mentionner au moins l'existence de ce droit.<sup>4</sup>

The truth of the matter is that Victor Hugo did not vote against the *droit au travail*, and that his attitude was quite different from that ascribed to him by M. de Lacretelle. Let us see exactly what happened.

On September 11, Representative Mathieu (de la Drôme) proposed to amend paragraph 8 to read as follows:

La République doit protéger le citoyen dans sa personne, sa famille, sa

---

<sup>3</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, August 31, 1848.

<sup>4</sup> P. de Lacretelle, *Vie politique de Victor Hugo*, Paris, Hachette, 1928, p. 95; italics mine.



religion et sa propriété. Elle reconnaît le droit de tous les citoyens à l'instruction, au travail et à l'assistance.<sup>5</sup>

Debate followed during which Ledru-Rollin, Crémieux, and others supported the amendment, de Tocqueville and Duvergier de Hauranne opposed it. On the next day *L'Événement* said:

Bien que M. Ledru-Rollin ait été attentivement écouté, il semble déjà évident que l'opinion de l'Assemblée est celle qu'a soutenue M. Duvergier de Hauranne et que, si le droit au travail est inscrit dans la Constitution, ce sera avec des restrictions qui lui retireront toute portée.

Eh! bien, nous avertissons l'Assemblée, en toute modération et en toute bonne foi, qu'elle se trompera, et qu'en voulant ainsi défendre l'ordre et sauvegarder l'avenir, elle compromettra l'avenir et l'ordre.

That *L'Événement* reflected Victor Hugo's own opinions is admitted by all scholars including M. de Lacretelle.<sup>6</sup>

On September 14, two interesting events occurred. In the first place Lamartine spoke against the amendment and showed himself, on this score at least, to be less liberal than the inspirer of *L'Événement*. The second event was the vote on the proposal of a new version offered by Representative Glais-Bizoin. The new text read:

La République doit protéger le citoyen dans sa personne, sa famille, sa religion, sa propriété, son travail; elle reconnaît le droit de tous les citoyens à l'instruction, le droit à l'existence par le travail et à l'assistance.<sup>7</sup>

Mathieu accepted this version and the amendment was put to vote. It was rejected by 596 to 187. The *Moniteur* lists Victor Hugo as being among those *Absents au moment du vote*, and in the absence of other evidence this must be considered as authoritative. Hugo's reason for not voting I have been unable to discover. It does not necessarily imply disapproval. Pierre Leroux also failed to vote, and Pierre Leroux was an unquestioned supporter of the *droit au travail*. But Hugo's attitude on the question had already been made clear by *L'Événement*, and it was now confirmed by further comment in that paper on September 15. *L'Événement* reported the vote and added:

<sup>5</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, September 12, 1848.

<sup>6</sup> P. de Lacretelle, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

<sup>7</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, September 15, 1848. The vote is recorded on page 2456 of this issue.

Ce droit simple, ce droit naturel, ce droit réellement divin, nous sommes de ceux qui l'ont défendu, s'il a besoin toutefois d'être défendu. Notre conscience nous l'ordonnait.

*L'Événement* then tried to explain the Assembly's action by suggesting that it had voted not so much against the *droit au travail* as against the socialists who supported it.<sup>8</sup>

On September 15, the committee on the constitution, somewhat alarmed by public reaction, brought in a new proposal. Paragraph 8 was to be modified to read:

La République doit, par une assistance fraternelle, assurer l'existence des citoyens nécessiteux, soit en leur procurant du travail dans la limite de ses ressources, soit en donnant des secours à ceux qui sont hors d'état de travailler.<sup>9</sup>

This version satisfied many, including Lamartine and even the editors of *Le National*.<sup>10</sup> It was carried by a *viva voce* vote without a rollcall. *L'Événement* expressed its editorial satisfaction:

Ainsi l'intention de l'Assemblée apparaît désormais évidente et claire aux esprits les plus défiants. La promesse est enregistrée, la pierre d'attente est posée. Dès qu'on pourra le faire sans péril, le droit saint au saint devoir du travail sera écrit dans la loi comme il est écrit dans les cœurs.

Doubtless Hugo shared this view—naïve, if you will, but widespread at the time—and doubtless that is the reason why he failed to support Félix Pyat when the latter raised the question again just before the final adoption of the constitution.<sup>11</sup>

What is to be concluded from these facts? Apart from the matter of misjudgment on Lacretelle's part, the problem throws light on Hugo's social philosophy in August and September 1848. That he was no radical was shown by his speech on the *Ateliers nationaux*.<sup>12</sup> But that he was no reactionary must be admitted, for on this issue of the right to work he ignored the warning of *Le*

<sup>8</sup> An interesting interpretation of this vote was made by the editor of *Le National* who said in the issue of September 15: "L'amendement de M. Glais-Bizoin a été rejeté à une forte majorité; mais on en a repoussé plutôt la rédaction que le sentiment." It shows that Hugo was not the only one deceived by the tactics of a conservative majority.

<sup>9</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, September 16, 1848.

<sup>10</sup> See its editorial printed in the issue of September 16, 1848.

<sup>11</sup> See *L'Événement*, November 2-3, 1848.

<sup>12</sup> Delivered on June 20, 1848.

*Constitutionnel* that "le droit au travail ne peut être que le communisme,"<sup>13</sup> he dissociated himself from de Falloux, de Montalembert, and company, and did not fear to join with Crémieux, Mathieu, Raspail, and even Proudhon. He was in fact a liberal who, while condemning extreme socialist measures and all violent methods, believed in the amelioration of society through piece-meal reform. It was, of course, illogical of him to condemn the *Ateliers nationaux* in June and to support the right to work in September, but to such inconsistencies liberalism seems to be forever addicted.<sup>14</sup>

ELLIOTT M. GRANT

Smith College

---

### LOPE'S PEREGRINO, HARDY, ROTROU, AND BEYS

Suggestions hitherto made in regard to the sources of Hardy's *Lucrèce* (pub. 1628), Rotrou's *Céliane* (pub. 1637, but probably first played in 1631-2), and Beys's *Hôpital des fous* (pub. 1635) are either negligible or have accounted for little more than a title or an isolated passage.<sup>1</sup> I have recently discovered that the chief source of Hardy's tragedy, that of Beys's tragi-comedy, and a partial source of *Céliane* are to be found in Lope's romantic novel, *El Peregrino en su patria*, first published in 1604 and made known to French authors by d'Audiguier ten years later, when he brought out a translation of it entitled *Les diverses fortunes de Panfile et de Nise*.

Hardy dramatized a story intercalated into the main plot of Lope's novel (pp. 21-7 in the edition of 1733), keeping all of its important events and, except for their Gallic endings, the names of the five leading persons, Télémaco, Lucrecia, Mireno, Everardo,

<sup>13</sup> *Le Constitutionnel*, July 18, 1848.

<sup>14</sup> The research for this article was made possible by a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, I, 48, 503, 553. Pui-busque asserted that *Lucrèce* came from a *novela* of Cervantes and Beys's play from Diego de Torres, who flourished in the eighteenth century! Rigal found no source for Hardy's play. I pointed out that, while Beys may have derived the title of his work from Lope's *El hospital de los locos* (*Los Locos de Valencia*), he could have received only minor suggestions from the plot of that play.

and Erifila.<sup>2</sup> He put into dialogue and into action scenes that had been described or suggested by Lope, made of Erifila a prostitute, enlarged the rôle of the heroine's servant, and added her husband's page in order that there might be someone on the stage at the end of the play. To Lope's influence may be credited the romantic atmosphere of the tragedy, the rapidity of the action, and the technical carelessness shown in the failure to indicate the fate of Erifila, but he is not responsible for the coarseness of the lovers' conversations, which must be due either to Hardy's taste or to that of his audience.

The facts that the hero and heroine of *Céliane* are named Pamphile and Nise, those of Lope's novel Panfilo and Nisa, and that in each case the heroine, disguised as a man, is wounded by a person who is devoted to her—her brother in Lope, her lover in Rotrou—suggest that Rotrou was influenced by Lope's novel, although it cannot be considered his main source, since the *Peregrino* contains no equivalents for the two most important motifs in the French play, the hero's effort to give the woman he loves to his benefactor and the trick by which the latter is persuaded to renounce her.

Beys's debt to Lope is much more important than Rotrou's, but less so than that of Hardy. The plot of *l'Hôpital des fous* is in the main that of *El Peregrino*,<sup>3</sup> but a number of Lope's episodes are

<sup>2</sup> In each case the strangely-named Lucrecia commits adultery with Mireno while her husband sleeps, the lover escapes by a rope-ladder, the husband, awaking, thinks he has heard robbers; Everardo seeks in vain to break up the *liaison*; Erifila informs Telémaco of it in the hope that he will guard his wife and Mireno return to her; Telémaco makes the lovers believe he has left town and returns in time to kill them in each other's arms; Everardo avenges his friend by slaying Telémaco.

<sup>3</sup> As in Lope, a young nobleman elopes with a girl, is captured by brigands, is condemned to death, and is spared at the last moment; the girl, thinking her lover dead, temporarily loses her mind, thus escaping the attentions of her captors' leader, and is placed in the insane asylum at Valencia, where she is discovered by her lover, who then pretends to be mad in order to be with her in this establishment. Her brother, seeking revenge, goes to the hero's home, falls in love with the latter's sister, takes her to France, kills a Frenchman in a duel, and is obliged to return to Spain without the woman he loves, who is brought back by another person. Both couples are finally united. There is also in both works a subordinate episode in which the hero of the work is loved by the sister of a man whom he has rescued from his enemies and who has in turn befriended him.

omitted, the names of the characters are changed, and the action now takes place in twenty-four hours and entirely within Valencia. Much of the first two acts and portions of the others are fairly close to the novel, but Beys makes very considerable alterations in order to increase the comic element and to work out his dénouement in a less perfunctory manner than Lope had done. It is true that the Spaniard had introduced into his novel three madmen—a soldier, a philosopher, and an astronomer,—but Beys, taking the hint, increased the number of the episodic madmen to six and made both them and their keeper comic. These amplifications make two scenes of the first act and most of the third almost entirely original. He also introduced so much new material into the last two acts that they bear little resemblance to the novel. While his borrowing from Lope is obvious enough, he is an independent imitator and it was in all probability his alterations rather than his imitations that made his play successful, for, when he rewrote it some seventeen years later (*les Illustres Fous*, played about 1651), he enlarged the comic element and sacrificed the romantic to a still greater extent.

*El Peregrino* seems to have been the first of Lope's works to influence a French dramatist. That three of them should turn to it independently shows that the novel, at least in translation, was well known in France. The fact that Hardy imitated it gives a new reason for dating *Lucrèce*, as I have done, 1615-1625, and makes it possible to say that we now know the sources of all of Hardy's extant tragedies. That the novel should have attracted Rotrou's attention is not surprising in view of the considerable use that the French dramatist made of Lope's plays, but, as in Beys's work no such influence had been detected except in the title of his *Hôpital des fous*, it is interesting to discover that he, too, owed much of his most successful play to the inventive Spaniard.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

#### AN OE. GLOSS: *OBER ELIMAN.INNANNORUM*

The puzzling gloss (or glosses) *Ober eliman.innannorum*, an explanation of which is here suggested, occurs in three Latin manuscripts in a section dealing with the interpretation of words

from the Book of Job. The immediate context of the gloss in the three MSS. is as follows,

St. Gall MS. 299, p. 6 (9/10th cent.):

Gilarii.

lapides modici quasi harena.Cocyt<sup>i</sup>.fluuius Inferni.  
pars  
Ober eliman.<sup>1</sup>Innannorū.Lacerto.pras brachii.i.musi.

Carlsruhe MS. Aug. cxxxv, fol. 102r (10th cent.):

Gilarii.lapides modici quasi  
s

arena.Cocithi.fluuius infeni.Ober eliman.innannorum.<sup>2</sup>Lacertos.  
pars brachii.

Stuttgart MS. theol. et phil. 218, fol. 39r (12th cent.):

Glarei.lapides modici quasi ha

Iutus  
rena.Cocyt' fluui' inferni.Ober eliman inan  
miusi.  
norum.<sup>3</sup>Lacertos.

Along with Old English and Old High German glosses this group of words, *Ober eliman.innannorum*, was published from the St. Gall and Carlsruhe MSS. in *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*<sup>4</sup> and was accompanied by Steinmeyer's remark, "mir ist die lateinische gl. ebenso unverständlich wie die deutsche." In 1911 Leydecker, in his collection of the Old English content from volume 1 of *Die ahd. Gl.*, treated *Ober eliman.innannorum* as an irreparable corruption.<sup>5</sup> He ventured the opinion that in *Ober* was perhaps concealed the word *Cocytus* or an oblique case thereof, that in *eliman* one might find *fluuius* or perhaps something like the Old English gloss *helle : infernus* or *hellemere : Stix*,<sup>6</sup> and that in *innannorum* one should perhaps read *infernorum*.<sup>7</sup> He considered

<sup>1</sup> In the MS. there is but little space between the *r* and the following *e*, as the final stroke of *r* nearly touches *e*.

<sup>2</sup> The letters *nnann* are written over an erasure.

<sup>3</sup> *um* in ligature (a stroke through the arm of *r*).

<sup>4</sup> 1, 496, 20.

<sup>5</sup> Christian Leydecker, *Über Beziehungen zwischen ahd. und ags. Glossen*, Bonn, 1911, pp. 26 and 64.

<sup>6</sup> These two OE. glosses are cited from Wright-Wülcker, *Vocabularies*, 144, 19 and 16.

<sup>7</sup> He noted that the Leiden Glossary contains the gloss *Coquiton.fluuius infernorum*.

it likely that the letter *s* written above in the Carlsruhe MS. referred originally to some OE. gloss. Shortly afterwards Schlutter called attention to the presence of the same gloss in the Stuttgart MS. and briefly suggested that *Ober eliman.innannorum* is a gloss to the following *lacertos*, that it is Old English, and that in it one should read *oberelein aū innanearm* = *oferelin vel innanearm*.<sup>8</sup> In 1922 Sievers rejected Schlutter's proposed solution and considered the gloss still a puzzle.<sup>9</sup>

It is possible that the two apparent parts, *Ober eliman* and *innannorum*, have no connection with each other, that they were originally written near each other above the line or on the margin, *Ober eliman* as a gloss to *Gilarii*, *innannorum* as a gloss to *inferni* (*infernorum*), and were drawn into the line by a copyist previous to the period of the three MSS. concerned.<sup>10</sup>

I suggest that in *Ober eliman* there has been a transposition of parts similar to the St. Gall MS. reading *vuorm corn*,<sup>11</sup> for *cornwurma*,<sup>12</sup> in the gloss *Uermiculus.vuorm corn* and that it is to be read *lim an obere*<sup>13</sup> 'mud on the shore.' The source of the lemmata *Gilarii* and *Cocyti* is found in Job 21, 33, which in the Vulgate

<sup>8</sup> *Zs. f. d. Wortforschung*, 14, 190.

<sup>9</sup> *Die ahd. Gl.*, 5, 291, where no solution is attempted. Sievers held Schlutter's suggestion "völlig ungläublich." I can not find it so inept. Both *oferelin* and *innanearm* were thought by Schlutter to be compounds elsewhere undocumented, but the latter is now known to be found in *Leechdoms*, 2, 234, 6. The suggestion, however, that one read *earm* in *orum* and *aū* in *an* is not convincing, and even if one accepted the reconstruction *aū*, its use would be unlikely, the common MS. practice being to express alternatives by *vel* or the corresponding MS. symbol *ē*.

<sup>10</sup> The Stuttgart MS., although much later than the other two, is not a copy of either. Cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 5, 291, 35 ff.

f

<sup>11</sup> On p. 8. Also *huuorm corn* in the Carlsruhe MS., fol. 102r; cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 589, 6. The Carlsruhe MS. also shows an odd transposition of parts in the gloss *dur fores dur heras*, 104v; cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 382, 20.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Vermiculus* : *cornwurma*, WW. 117, 31; *Vemiculus* : *cornuurma*, WW. 53, 19; *Muricibus* : *cornwurmm*, OEG. 5141.

<sup>13</sup> For the *b* in *obere* compare the Corpus gloss *margo* : *obr*. The MS. division *ober eliman* is of little value for determining the correct division of the words as abnormal divisions are not infrequent in glosses, for ex-

s

example: *ua gyrst* for *uagyrost* (*wagrif*) and *gil dibilegid* for *gildi bilegid*, Carlsruhe MS., fol. 100v.

reads: *Dulcis fuit glareis Cocyti*. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* defines *glarea*: *genus quoddam harenæ crassioris ex minutis lapillis constantis, qualis invenitur et in ripis aquarum et in sterilibus terrae locis*. Fitting this definition the gloss to *glarea* in Old English is often *ceosel*.<sup>14</sup> But *glarea* appears also in glosses with a somewhat different interpretation, for example, *terram conpugimenta id est condensa*.<sup>15</sup> Diefenbach<sup>16</sup> cites to *glarea* the Latin gloss *terra tenax, limosa* and among Germanic glosses gives *mergel, leym, ton, erde*. In Napier's *Old English Glosses*<sup>17</sup> occurs *Glarea: Read eorde*. These glosses show an interpretation of *glarea* as something like 'sticky earth.' In this sense it is fitly glossed by OE. *lim*. In general OE. *lim* means 'anything sticky,' 'lime,' 'mortar,' 'cement,' 'gluten.'<sup>18</sup> In the Regius Psalter<sup>19</sup> and in the Lambeth Psalter<sup>20</sup> *lime* renders Latin *limo* which in the Canterbury Psalter<sup>21</sup> is rendered by *lame* & *slim* and which is elsewhere<sup>22</sup> glossed by *laam* 'clay,' 'mud,' 'mire.' In the gloss *linitura .i. liim claam*<sup>23</sup> OE. *lim* stands parallel with *clām* 'mud,' 'mortar,' 'clay.' In the Canterbury Psalter<sup>24</sup> the Latin *lutum platearum* is rendered *þæt fen t lim þæræ stræte* and here the meaning is plainly 'mud,' 'mire.' A bit of MS. evidence that may be connected with the interpretation that *Gilarii* is glossed by *lim* is the fact that the Stuttgart MS. has above *Cocytus* and following the Latin gloss to *Glarei* the word *lutus*. Perhaps this is a corruption of *luctus* and hence a possible gloss to *Cocytus* but as it stand *lutus* 'mud,' 'clay,' 'slime' may be a gloss to *Glarei*. In one of the earliest English versions of the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Napier, *Old English Glosses*, 2879; 4102; 2, 51; 2, 287.

<sup>15</sup> *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 5, 205, 26.

<sup>16</sup> L. Diefenbach, *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum Mediae et Infimae Aetatis*, Francof., 1857.

<sup>17</sup> 18b, 40.

<sup>18</sup> Hall's *Dictionary*, 3d ed., p. 219.

<sup>19</sup> *Der altenglische Regius-Psalter*, ed. F. Roeder in *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, 18. Psalm 68, 3.

<sup>20</sup> *Der Lambeth-Psalter*, ed. U. Lindelöf in *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, tom. 35. Psalm 68, 3.

<sup>21</sup> *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, ed. F. Harsley in EETS. 92. Psalm 68, 3.

<sup>22</sup> WW. *Vocabularies*, 30, 25. Also *lame* glosses *limo* at Ps. 68, 3 in other OE. glossed psalters.

<sup>23</sup> Carlsruhe MS. cxxxv, fol. 103r; *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 640, 3.

<sup>24</sup> Psalm 17, 43.



Bible the phrase corresponding to *glareis* in the Vulgate in this passage from Job is *the stoonys, ether filthis, of helle* (instead of *filthis* a variant reading has *filthi erthe*)<sup>25</sup> an interpretation quite similar to the one suggested for the passage in question. The additional explanation, *an obere* 'on the shore,' is in keeping with the fact that *glarea* may imply the shore, especially in the group *glareis Cocyti*. In an analogous manner *arena* is glossed in Old High German by *grieze des stades*,<sup>26</sup> and Coverdale<sup>27</sup> translated this portion of Job as *amonge the stones by the broke syde*. To this gloss, *lim an obere*, may refer the letter *s* which in the Carlsruhe MS. stands above the following *innannorum*.<sup>28</sup>

Concerning *innannorum* I agree with Leydecker that in view of the ending *orum* one should take into consideration the gloss to *Cocytus* as it appears in the eighth-century Leiden Glossary: *Coquiton.fluuius infernorum*.<sup>29</sup> While the three MSS. immediately concerned read *fluuius infe(r)ni*, besides the Leiden MS. in the group of MSS. with Old English-Old High German glosses to the Books of the Bible the ninth-century Paris MS. Lat. 2685 reads *Quotiti.fluuius infernorum* (fol. 55v) and the tenth-century Bern MS. 258 reads *Cocyti.fluuius infenorum* (fol. 16r). To the lemma in this form I suggest that *innannorum* was added as a gloss thus, *.i.maniorum*. It is significant that a large number of the glosses in the three MSS. containing the gloss in question are introduced by *.i.* and in some cases this letter is written so close to the following word that only the dot distinguishes it as a separate part. How it might be drawn into the following gloss may be seen in the St. Gall MS. on page 12, *Litura.Ipflaster*.<sup>30</sup> It is not unlikely that an

<sup>25</sup> *The Holy Bible in the Earliest English Versions, Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers*, edited by Forshall and Madden, Oxford, 1850. Unfortunately Aelfric's free rendering of parts of Job does not cover the section concerned.

<sup>26</sup> Graff, *Sprachschatz*, 4, 345.

<sup>27</sup> *The Holy Scriptures Translated by Myles Coverdale*. Reprinted from the copy in the library of the Duke of Sussex for Samuel Bagster, London, 1838.

<sup>28</sup> This letter *s* probably stands for *saxonice*, as it does in connection with other glosses in the MS., for instance *cylli<sup>s</sup>, uiluc<sup>s</sup> besu*.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Hessels, *The Leiden Latin Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, Cambridge, 1906, p. 18. The gloss is preceded in the Leiden MS. by *Glarea.lapides modici*.

<sup>30</sup> Published in *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 640, 1 as *Litura.i.pflaster* but in the

original *i. maniorum* may have been copied as *innannorum*. Such a corruption arises from the misreading of strokes and is a common cause of variation in words copied from one manuscript into another.<sup>31</sup> That there was some confusion in the reading of strokes in this word appears from the manuscripts, two of which read *innannorum* while the third reads *inannorum*, and in the Carlsruhe MS. the letters *nnann* are over an erasure. *maniorum* is a documented genitive plural of *manes*,<sup>32</sup> which has as one meaning 'infernal regions.'<sup>33</sup> In relation to *infernus* the word occurs in the glosses *manes: inferni*,<sup>34</sup> *manes: inferna*,<sup>35</sup> *manes: inferna uel sepulchra fauillasti maiorum*.<sup>36</sup>

The words *Ober eliman. innannorum* defy interpretation when taken exactly as they stand. The solution here suggested calls for changes which coincide with the peculiarities of the manuscripts concerned. It can not claim finally to solve the puzzle in this group of words, but it attempts from a new point of view the explanation of a problem of long standing.

HERBERT MERITT

Hamilton College

---

MS. no dot follows the *i*, which is close to the following letter. A similar case is found in the Carlsruhe MS., fol. 100r: *Extentera.i.aperi uentrem eius.iaspidē* (cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 475, 14). The *i* and *a* of *iaspidē* are joined in the MS.; in this case however there is a trace of a dot above and to the right of *i* and it is probable that the gloss should be read *i. aspidē*. Cf. Schlutter's interpretation of the gloss in *Anglia*, 46, p. 331 and *Englische Studien*, 49, p. 156. In the St. Gall MS. the same sort of error occurs with the symbol *.s*; the Carlsruhe MS., fol. 102v, reads *Murenulas.s. ciniuiipan* but the St. Gall MS., p. 8, has *sciniuiipant* (cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 589, 19). In the Leiden Glossary glosses are not infrequently introduced by *i*. and here there is at least one instance where the dot after *i* is omitted and the *i* stands close to the following letter: *Ligones.ferrum fusorium.ityr-fahga* fol. 26r; xvii, 2 in Hessels' edition.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Carlsruhe MS. reading *sineduma* for *smeduma*, fol. 104r (*Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 375, 1). For a list of corruptions from the misreading of strokes see Hessels' edition of the Corpus Glossary, p. xviii.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil, Leipzig, 1868, v, 196.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Georges, *Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* under *münēs*.

<sup>34</sup> M108 in Hessels' edition of the Corpus Glossary.

<sup>35</sup> *Corpus Glossarium Latinorum*, 4, 536, 9bc.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 4, 112, 44.

## A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S FRIAR

The commentators have expressed some difference of opinion as to the implication of the following lines in Chaucer's characterization of the Friar in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*:

He hadde maad ful many a mariage  
Of yonge wommen at his owene cost. (A 212-3).

In a pardonable desire to minimize the Friar's bad repute, one or two have explained these lines as meaning that he had enabled numerous runaway couples to marry without paying fees, or had assumed general responsibility.<sup>1</sup> A more widely accepted interpretation is that this reprobate, at his own expense, had provided for the marriages of sundry young women who had been his concubines.<sup>2</sup> Although this derogatory implication seems to me inescapable, the only historical record adduced in support of it, so far as I know, is a letter of the year 1535 cited long ago by Dr. Furnivall. In this missive to Cromwell, Dr. Layton mentions "an holy father prior" who had seduced a number of girls, "and always mareded them ryght well."<sup>3</sup> Although one finds no pleasure in multiplying the misdemeanors of the mediaeval clergy, I offer in elucidation of Chaucer's intention a statement from a prelate of the poet's own century. This document is the following unpublished memorandum of the year 1321 from the register of John de Droghensford, bishop of Bath and Wells:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See E. Flügel, in *Journal of German Philology*, I (1897), 133-5; H. B. Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer*, Northampton, 1907, p. 18. J. S. Brewer, in his edition of *Monumenta Franciscana* [vol. I], London, 1858, p. xl, appears to interpret the Friar's action as being merely an "encouragement of marriage."

<sup>2</sup> See W. W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, v, Oxford, 1900, pp. 25-6; M. H. Liddell, *Chaucer*, New York, 1911, p. 146; J. M. Manly, *Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer*, New York [1928], p. 511; F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston [1933], p. 753.

<sup>3</sup> F. J. Furnivall, *A Temporary Preface to the Six-text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Part I (Chaucer Society, Second Series, no. 3), London, 1868, pp. 117-8, quoting the letter from T. Wright, *Three Chapters of Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries* (Camden Society, xxvi), London, 1843, 58. Skeat (*loc. cit.*) makes full use of this evidence.

<sup>4</sup> The memorandum is described by Bishop Edmund Hobhouse in his *Calendar of the Register of John de Droghensford*, in *Somerset Record*

## MEMORANDUM PRO VICARIO DE WESTBURY.

Memorandum quod coram nobis, I,<sup>5</sup> permissione diuina Bathoniensi et Wellensi Episcopo, in aula manerii nostri de Westbury die Iouis, videlicet quarto Idus Decembris Anno Domini M°.CCC°.XXI°, conparuerunt Ricardus Parker ° de Westbury et Editha vxor eius de Galfrido vicario de Westbury conquerentes imponendo sibi quod Iulianam filiam dicte Edithe deflorando carnaliter cognouit, et ex ea duas proles suscitauit, ac coram ipsis et aliis amicis dicte mulieris firmiter promisit, vt dicunt, quod ad dicte Iuliane promocionem maritalem pro possibilitate sua iuuaret; quod postea facere non curauit. Demum, vocato dicto vicario, a premissis sibi obiectis fatebatur quod dicta Iuliana ad domum suam sponte sepius accessit, et ex huius accessu ipsam de voluntate sua spontanea tandem carnaliter cognouit, et ex ea duas proles suscitauit, super quibus fuerat per officialem Domini Decani Wellensis iudicium suum in ea parte competentem debite correctus, prout per litteras ipsius officialis tunc exhibitas euidenter apparuit, adiciendo quod dictam Iulianam non deflorauit nec tenuit secum uel alibi, ipsiusque Iuliane maritagio, vt suggeritur, subuenire non promisit, set quod prefati Ricardus et vxor sua falso et maliciose eum iudicari fecerunt, ac dispendia non modica et obprobria sepius intulerunt et ab aliis sibi fieri nequiter procurarunt, que omnia et singula se optulit litteris<sup>7</sup> probaturum. Habita igitur diutina altercacione super hiis inter ipsas partes, demum predictae partes ordinacioni nostre decreto et laudo alte et basse se submiserunt. Nos itaque de consilio assedencium, pro omni tollenda discordia ac pacis tranquillitate inter ipsas partes confouenda in futurum, ordinauimus et precepimus quod dictus vicarius de sex marcis ad promocionem maritalem dicte Iuliane per dictos Ricardum et Editham vxorem suam procurandam et faciendam caritatiue subueniret soluendo prefatis Ricardo et vxori sue ad opus dicte Iuliane: duas marcas in festo Pasche tunc proximo sequente, et alias duas marcas in festo Pasche anno proximo sequente, ac reliquas duas marcas anno tercio proximo sequente, ita quod dictus Ricardus et vxor sua sint sibi extunc boni et fideles amici, nullumque dispendium sibi inferent uel scandalum aliaquale, nec per alios quoscunque clam uel palam dicto vicario fieri procurabunt. Et si contingat eos talia contra eum committere in posterum inferre uel procurare maliciose et iniuste extunc, soluere teneantur et debeant dicto vicario sex marcas infra tempus supradictum vel tantum tempus subsequens a die quo per dictos Ricardum et vxorem suam aut alterum eorum dispendium uel scandalum infertur aut procuracionem eorum vt predicatur inferri con-

*Society*, I (1887), 166; and this description is referred to H. G. Richardson, in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Third Series, VI (1912), 123.

<sup>5</sup> I] The reference is to Iohannes de Droksensford, the bishop.

<sup>6</sup> Parker] This word is not capitalized, and, as Hobhouse observes (*op. cit.*, p. 166), it may indicate merely that Richard was the bishop's park-keeper.

<sup>7</sup> litteris] Not completely legible.

tingat. Ad que fideliter obseruanda dicti Ricardus et vxor sua tactis sacrosanctis Ewangeliis corporale prestiterunt iuramentum submittendo se cohibicioni nostre ac officialis nostri si eos in aliquo contra ordinacionem nostram prescriptam contrauenire contingat. Presentibus magistris I. Brabazon sacre theologie professore, Ricardo de Thisteldene rectore ecclesie de Lympalesham, Ricardo de Alresford rectore ecclesie de Hoghtoun, Willelmo Beteuille, clericis, et I. de Wamburgh, notario. In cuius rei testimonium presenti memorando sigillum nostrum ad rogatum humilem dicti vicarii duximus apponendum. Datum die, loco et anno predictis.

From this record it appears that a vicar, named Geoffrey, was charged with having broken his promise to provide funds toward a suitable marriage for a certain Juliana, by whom he had had two children. Although he denied the promise of reparation, the vicar acknowledged his abuse of Juliana, and the paternity of the children. After some wrangling with Juliana's parents, he submitted to the bishop's award requiring him to pay six marks, in instalments, as an aid to the injured girl toward arriving at an appropriate marriage.

This incident would seem to illustrate clearly enough what Chaucer probably meant by the Friar's having arranged marriages of young women "at his owene cost."

KARL YOUNG

*Yale University*

## CHAUCER'S *LADYES FOURE AND TWENTY*

An element added by Chaucer in the Wife of Bath's Tale to the popular tale of the knight and the loathly lady is what appears to be a fairy induction,<sup>1</sup> the description of the ladies whom the knight sees dancing on the green.

And in his wey it happed hym to ryde,  
In al his care, under a forest syde,  
Wher as he saugh upon a daunce go  
Of ladyes foure and twenty and yet mo;  
Toward the whiche daunce he drow ful yerne,  
In hope that som wysdom sholde he lerne.  
But certainly, er he cam fully there,  
Vanysshed was this daunce, he nyste where.  
No creature saugh he that bar lyf,

<sup>1</sup>Lucy Allen Paton, *Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, Boston, 1903, Chap. II.

Save on the grene he saugh sittynge a wyf . . .

A fouler wight ther may no man devyse.<sup>2</sup>

The effect of the passage is to heighten the feeling of the supernatural and to prepare the mind for the power of the hag.<sup>3</sup>

Strikingly similar to this is a passage in the *De Nugis Curialium* of Walter Map:

Aliud non miraculum sed portentum nobis Walenses referunt. Wastinum Wastiniauc secus stagnum Brekeniauc, quod in circuitu duo milaria tenet, mansisse aiunt et vidisse per tres claras a luna noctes choreas feminarum in campo auene sue et secutum eum eas fuisse donec in aqua stagni submergerentur, unam tamen quarta vice retinuisse.<sup>4</sup>

Both of these passages are used as transitions. The story of Wastin follows accounts of monks and miracles and kings and is the first of a series of marvels. It is found in a section of the work headed by the following prologue:

Victoria carnis est adversus (racionem), quod que Dei sunt minus appetit homo, que mundi maxime. Racio vero cum tenetur anime triumphus est, reddit que Cesaris Cesari, que Dei Deo. Duo premisi Dei misericordiam et iudicium continencia, que non solum non delectant, sed tediosa sunt, et expectantur sicut expectantur fabule poetarum, uel earum simie. Differantur tamen, si non auferantur, et que scimus aut credimus miracula premittamus.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> F. N. Robinson, *Complete Works of Chaucer*, Cambridge, 1933, Fragment III, vv. 989-999.

<sup>3</sup> H. R. Patch, "Chaucer and Mediaeval Romance," *Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell*, Cambridge, 1926, 108. Dorothy Everett, "The English Mediaeval Romances," *Essays and Studies of the English Association*, xv, Oxford, 1929, 109 and note, 110.

<sup>4</sup> *De Nugis Cur.*, ed. M. R. James, *Anec. Oxon.*, Mediaeval and Modern Series, Part XIV, Oxford, 1914, Dist. II, Cap. XI. A somewhat similar passage is to be found in the *Historia Danica* of Saxo Grammaticus, trans. Elton and Powell, Publ. Folklore Soc. XXXIII, London, 1894, III, 84: About this time, Hother chanced, while hunting, to be led astray by a mist, and he came on a certain lodge in which there were wood-maidens. And when they greeted him by his own name, he asked who they were. They declared it was their guidance and government that mainly determined the fortunes of war. For they often invisibly took part in battles, and by their secret assistance won for their friends the coveted victories. When Hother heard this, the place melted away and left him shelterless. . . . See also the story of Edric Wilde, told by Walter Map, *op. cit.*, Dist. II, Cap. XII. I am indebted to Professor Howard R. Patch for indicating these parallels to me.

<sup>5</sup> Map, *op. cit.*, Dist. II. See James Hinton, "Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*, Its Plan and Composition," *PMLA*, xxxii, 1917, 81.

In the Wife of Bath's Tale, the description of the dancing ladies also appears as a transition—from the worldly, natural atmosphere of the prologue to the supernatural atmosphere of the knight and the loathly lady. It seems to me highly probable that Chaucer consciously inserted this description, recalling it from a knowledge of Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*.<sup>6</sup>

LILLA TRAIN

Northampton, Mass.

### ANOTHER "CANTERBURY TALE"

An interesting piece of woods lore, which seems to have escaped the Chaucer allusion hunters, appears in the writings of Col. William Byrd, in his account of the dividing line between Virginia and North Carolina. Byrd reports the tale from a certain Mr. Wilson who in 1728, at the time the line was marked between the two colonies, was living on the east side of the Dismal Swamp, but who "knew as little of it as he did of Terra Australis Incognita:"

He told us a Canterbury tale of a North Briton, whose curiosity spurred him a long way into this great desert . . . near twenty years ago, but he having no compass, nor seeing the sun for several days together, wandered about till he was almost famished; but at last he bethought himself of a secret his countrymen make use of to pilot themselves in a dark day. He took a fat louse out of his collar, and exposed it to the open day on a piece of white paper. . . . The poor insect, having no eye-lids, turned himself about till he found the darkest part of the heavens, and so made the best of his way towards the north. By this direction he steered himself safe out, and gave such a frightful account of the monsters he saw, and the distresses he underwent, that no mortal since has been hardy enough to go upon the like dangerous discovery.<sup>1</sup>

This printing of the tale, in 1841, almost a century after

<sup>6</sup> The evidence for Chaucer's knowledge of Map's work has been based hitherto on the use in the Wife of Bath's Prologue and the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women (Text G) of the *Epistola Valerii ad Rufinum de non ducenda uxore*, now generally admitted to be Map's.

For account of the fourteenth century manuscript see *De Nugis*, ed. James, Preface xi.

<sup>1</sup> *The Westover Manuscripts: Containing the History of the Dividing Line betwixt Virginia and North Carolina . . . Written from 1728 to 1736 . . . by William Byrd of Westover, Petersburg.* Printed by Edmund and Julian C. Ruffin, 1841, p. 20.

Byrd's death, purports to be the first. The Wynne edition of 1866,<sup>2</sup> "Printed from the Original Manuscript," is a second printing of the Chaucer allusion before 1900.

*West Virginia University*

LOUIS W. CHAPPELL

# SUGGESTED REPUNCTUATION OF A PASSAGE IN *BEOWULF*

May I suggest a repunctuation of the short passage (ll. 745b-749) that begins Beowulf's fight with Grendel? Klaeber has it (so also Grundtvig, Heyne-Schücking, Heyne-Socin, Sedgefield, Trautmann, Wyatt and Chambers, etc.):

Forð nēar ætstōp,  
nam þā mid handa higeþihtigne  
rinc on ræste,    ræhte tōgēan[es]  
fēond mid folme;    hē onfēng hraþe  
inwitþancum    ond wið earm gesæt.<sup>1</sup>

Almost all variations of this (Arnold, Grein, Heyne, Kemble, Schaldemose, Thorpe, etc.) end the clause—and so change the subject from Grendel to Beowulf—after *ræste* rather than *folme*.

In either case there are obviaable objections. In the first (as quoted) Grendel reaches toward his enemy after he has taken hold of him; besides, *fēond* is made to refer to Beowulf, when in every other instance of its singular use in the Grendel episode, it refers directly to Grendel [cf. also Wülker, *Engl. Stud.* 23. 306].

In the second common punctuation, this latter objection is removed; the first clause ends after *ræste* and the subject changes. But it does so too abruptly: the reference of the understood subject of *ræhte* to *rinc* is not clear and *hē* in the next line becomes superfluous.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas H. Wynne, *History of the Dividing Line and Other Tracts, from the Papers of William Byrd, of Westover, in Virginia, Esquire*, Richmond, Va., 1866, p. 39 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Klaeber's text and line-numbering are used here. A note to line 6, p. 36 of the Zupitza autotype (E. E. T. S. orig. ser. 77) reads: "after *ræste* an erasure of some five letters, of which the first seems to have been *h*, the second possibly was *a*." This does not affect the present question, the erasure being accepted as genuine by most editors.



This choice of punctuations has depended on whether *fēond* was considered nom. or acc.; nobody has thought to question the case of *rinc*. But let us start our new clause with it as nominative:

Forð nēar ætstōp,  
 nam þā mid handa    higeþihtigne;  
 rinc on ræste    ræhte tōgēan[es]  
 fēond mid folme:    hē onfēng hraþe  
 inwitþancum    ond wið earm gesæt.

This makes of *higeþihtigne* an adjective substantively used, but it also makes the change of subject perfectly clear, as it does the antecedent of *hē*, while still preserving the specialized meaning of *fēond*. The change of subject before *ræhte* gives us licence for going backward in time, since we are now talking of Beowulf; *folme* refers to his famous thirty-man-power grip, while *hraþe* and *ræhte*, both showing his eagerness, reinforce each other.

F. G. CASSIDY

*University of Michigan*

### BEOWULF, 489-490

*Site nu to symle ond on sæl meoto  
 Sigehrep secgum, swa þin sefa hwette.*

In his first address to Hroþgar, Beowulf asks permission for himself and his band of Geats unhindered by Danes to stay in Heorot during the coming night; and, boasting a bit, he prophesies probable success for himself in his proposed fight there with Grendel. In the reply, of which these two lines are the end, Hroþgar admits that God might easily put an end to Grendel, presumably by means of such a god-sent agent as Beowulf, but confesses, nevertheless, that all his Danes have come to grief when they dared face the monster. He concludes, in effect, by saying: "Death removed all Danes who made the attempt to worst Grendel. But sit down and eat. [The hall is yours, as you have requested.] And in the hall [before the fight, however doubtful its outcome] reckon on victory for men [over Grendel, who can hardly be called a man] as you are inclined to do [though I know what happened to my Danes.]"

This version of this passage, and notably of *on sæl* ("in the hall") in it, seems worth insisting upon, though it is rarely, if

ever, given. Hroþgar naturally would reply immediately to Beowulf's request to be allowed to occupy the Danish thronehall with his Geats: the situation is unusual and the granting of the request significant, as ll. 653-661 make clear. The translation seems sound, since *meoto* has already been frequently regarded as a second person imperative and since similar *on*-phrases with the accusative are common — see "on" in Bosworth and Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, B, I, 2-3.

ARTHUR E. DuBOIS

*Duquesne University*

---

### THE CHRONOLOGY OF FRENCH LOAN-WORDS IN ENGLISH

Jespersen's table showing the chronology of French loan-words in English<sup>1</sup> is well known and often cited. Based upon 1000 French words, sorted into half centuries on the evidence of the earliest quotations in the *NED.*, it showed graphically that there was no perceptible penetration of French words into English until after 1150, that the great period of adoption was from 1250 to 1400, and that a sharp drop in the fifteenth century has been followed by a gradual tapering off ever since. His calculation was made when only about half of the *Oxford Dictionary* was available, and while this should be a sufficient basis for such a statistical study, I have recently had occasion to test his figures by a calculation based upon the completed dictionary and in one or two significant respects have arrived at different results. The new calculation therefore seems worth putting on record. In offering it I am not unmindful of the fact that Professor Jespersen was the first to perform the experiment and, however simple it seems now, he deserves the credit, like Columbus in the story of the egg, for having thought of it.

My calculation, like his, is based on 1000 French words. I began by taking all words on pages numbered -50 and -00 throughout the dictionary, but this yielded less than half the desired number of words. It was finally necessary to include also pages numbered -20, -40, -60, -80. After eliminating nonce words and a small

<sup>1</sup> *Growth and Structure*, 4th ed., p. 94.

number (designated as unassimilated in the *NED.*) which clearly had never been a part of the English language in any real sense, the total number of entries was 1031, of which I arbitrarily kept the first 1000. Purely English derivatives occurring on the same page with the base word were ignored. However, where the base word was on a preceding page I have counted the base word as the representative of the derivatives. Thus I allow *air* (1230) to represent *airily* (1797), *airiness* (1674), *airing* (1610), *airish* (1384), and *airless* (1601) since these derivatives were clearly not instances of words "borrowed" at the dates when they first occurred yet could not be ignored. They imply the existence of the word *air* and it seemed right to record the base word *air* (although on a previous page) and credit it to the half century in which it first appears. While Jespersen's method of taking the first hundred French words under A-G (and the first fifty under I and J) did not necessitate such a procedure, the fact that he also excluded derivatives of English formation makes his procedure really quite comparable.<sup>2</sup> For convenience of reference I give the figures of his table and mine in parallel columns:

	Jespersen	
.... 1050	2	2
1051-1100	2	0
1101-1150	1	2
1151-1200	15	7
1201-1250	64	35
1251-1300	127	99
1301-1350	120	108
1351-1400	180	198
1401-1450	70	74
1451-1500	76	90
1501-1550	84	62
1551-1600	91	95
1601-1650	69	61
1651-1700	34	37
1701-1750	24	33
1751-1800	16	26
1801-1850	23	46
1851-1900	2	25

---

<sup>2</sup> I have corrected the dates for about a score of words. The citations from the *Cursor Mundi* in the earlier volumes of the dictionary are variously

It will be observed at once that the most significant difference in these two columns is in the figures for the period 1150-1250, my table indicating a much slower rate of increase. The preeminence of the half century 1350-1400 is even more strikingly revealed. At the same time the figures of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially the nineteenth, are noticeably higher. This, I believe, is due to an important difference of method. Jespersen discarded all words not illustrated by at least five quotations. This works to the disadvantage of late borrowings, since the *NED.* seldom gives as many as five quotations from the same century, unless to illustrate various senses, and would have resulted in the elimination from my collection of such words as *alienist*, *bon-bon*, *carton*, *chaise-longue*, *char-a-banc*, *chiffon*, *coulomb*, *declass*, *demi-monde*, *gamin*, *millionaire*, *premiere*, and *remarque*.

I should like to point out what seems to me a necessary weakness in both tables. This is not so much the fact that a word may have been in common use somewhat earlier than the earliest *NED.* quotation. This seems to me, as it did to Jespersen, not to affect seriously the general picture presented by fifty year periods. I refer rather to the fact that the number of words found in a given period (at least up to 1400), seems to bear a very direct relation to the amount of literature preserved through the various centuries of Middle English. Unfortunately there is no remedy for whatever element of error results from this circumstance.

It may be noted in conclusion that of the 1031 words derived from the pages examined for the above calculation, 611 first occur

dated, but after a time the editors seem to have adopted the dating "*a(n)te* 1300" for all citations except those peculiar to the Göttingen MS. I have accordingly used this date (except for the Göttingen MS.) although a date 1300-1325 would perhaps have been better. Such a procedure has the advantage of allowing for the possibility that words first recorded in the *Cursor* were already in use at the close of the thirteenth century. I have also changed the date of quotations from the *Pearl* poet. These are dated 1300 in the *NED.*, which is certainly too early. I have followed the general opinion in assigning these to the half century 1350-1400. It would have been possible to re-date certain other quotations in the light of more recent scholarly opinion, but since it is difficult to know when to stop I have in these cases followed the *NED.* dating. In any case re-dating would not often have changed the half-century in which a word fell.

between 1150 and 1500. This would indicate a total adoption of French words in Middle English of slightly more than 10,000. Of these about seventy-five per cent have remained in general use.

ALBERT C. BAUGH

*University of Pennsylvania*

## HOODLUM

The origin of the English word HOODLUM is still unexplained. The *New English Dictionary* says: "The name originated in San Francisco about 1870-72, and began to excite attention elsewhere in the U. S. about 1877, by which time its origin was lost, and many fictitious stories, concocted to account for it, were current in newspapers."

The earliest citation in *NED*.<sup>1</sup> is from the *Sacramento Weekly Union* of February 24, 1872. "All the boys to be trained as . . . polite loafers, street-hounds, *hoodlums*, and bummers."<sup>2</sup> All these impolite appellations savor of the German. A dialect (Low German) form of *laufen* is suspected of being the ultimate origin of the U. S. slang term LOAFER.<sup>3</sup> BUMMER, likewise U. S. slang, and generally accepted to be of German origin, is a California product a few years older than HOODLUM.<sup>4</sup> STREET-HOUNDS is at least a German-like compound.<sup>5</sup> This environment should discredit the MULDOON > NOODLUM > HOODLUM fiction<sup>6</sup> and render suspect a "Spanish origin"<sup>7</sup> or a "pidgin English" theory.<sup>7</sup>

The second earliest citation: "Three hoodlums in San Francisco

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Farmer, John S., *Americanisms, Old and New*, London, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Thornton, Richard H., *An American Glossary*, London, 1912.

<sup>3</sup> *NED*. "G. landläufer (Landlouper)." *Century Dictionary*, "Germ. laufen; Du. loopen." Cf. also the German Strassenläufer, tramp. N. B. The first four recordings of LOAFER in Thornton emanate from the Dutch-German section of New York State, 1835-37. The earliest citation in *NED*. is in Thornton chronologically the fifth, and the first from outside of the Hudson Valley.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Thornton, I, 119.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e. g., Strassenjunge, Strassenbube, Strassenläufer and Lumpenhund, *infra*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Thornton, I, 444.

<sup>7</sup> Albert Barrère and Charles G. Leland, *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant*, London, 1897, p. 443.

were convicted on a charge of stealing beer",<sup>8</sup> suggests Germany and, even more, Bavaria. In both Sacramento, originally called New Helvetia by its south-German founder, Sutter, and San Francisco the Germans constituted the largest foreign-language group.<sup>9</sup>

The Germans, and especially the Bavarians, have a word which is, both phonetically and semantically, almost identical with HOODLUM. In colloquial Bavarian the word HODALUMP is quite common. In the recent little book *999 Worte Bayrisch* by Johann Lachner<sup>10</sup> it occurs often enough to make its meaning evident. When Lachner says that not even such language as "du brauchst Mäu nēt ä sōh aufreisz'n gēgn meinä, du Hodälump, du schlechtä" would cause a son to lay hands on his father, he implies that the word can have a very strong force.<sup>11</sup> He also states: "Je nach der Lage kritisierend, komisch, oder anerkennend sind die Bezeichnungen Tröhpf, Lump, Hodälump . . . Gaunä, Luädä, Spihzbuä," etc.<sup>12</sup>

Moreover both components, as well as the entire word, have long been known to literary German in the sense of HOODLUM.

Cf. Grimm's Wörterbuch:

HADER (2a) *fetzen, lumpen.*

(2c) *als schimpfwort für einen nichtswürdigen menschen, vgl. lump.*

HADERBUBE; HADERKATZE; HADERLUMP, —LUMPE, —LUMPEN, 2a) *in Tirol häderlump.*

HODEL, HÖDEL "bei Luther in der bedeutung lumpen . . . bildlich, von einem menschen"

HUDEL 1) *lumpen, lappen . . . später öfter und aus verschiedenen namentlich oberdeutschen landschaften bezeugt: panniculus.*

3) *schimpfwort für einen nichtswürdigen menschen (wie lump) noch jetzt schweizerisch viel gebraucht.*

HUDELBUBE

HUDELLAUFEN *vermummtes laufen zur fastnachtzeit: in Tirol.*

HUDELLUMP, —LUMPE *wie haderlump.*

HUDELMANN . . . *schwüb. hudelmanns waare, schlechtes gesindel.*

HUDELN verb 1b) *schweizerisch er hudelt nur führt nur eine schlechte lebensweise.*

HUDELPACK, HUDELSACK, HUDELVOLK, HUDER, HUDLER, HUDELGESINDE, *few populi*

HUDLICHT, *lumpicht . . . auch im moralischen sinne, despectus, inglorious, frivolus.*

<sup>8</sup> Thornton, I, 444.

<sup>9</sup> *A Compendium of the Ninth Census* (June 1, 1870), Washington, 1872.

<sup>10</sup> München, no date, bei Müller. <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105. <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

LUMP (rag) means today "nichtswürdiger Mensch" < 17th century "Mensch in zerlumpten Kleidern" < 16th century "zerfetztes stück zeug."<sup>13</sup> "Du Lump!" is a common, every-day expression for "You scamp!" See also Grimm:

LUMPENGESINDE, LUMPENHUND, LUMPENKERL, LUMPENMANN, 3) *armseliger, nichtswürdiger Mann.*

LUMPENPACK, LUMPENVOLK

LUMPENWAARE . . . *in Baiern lumpenwar auch von armseligen personen.*

It is evident that the HUDEL form is more common in the *oberdeutsch* territory. HUDELLUMP is a tautological formation, each part meant originally "rag(s)." Each component then acquired the meaning, a "raggedy," lowly, base person. The compound word has the meaning of each of these parts, i. e., raggamuffin, hoodlum.

We need only assume that in the process of borrowing the final "p" was lost and we have accounted for the form of our American word.

JOHN T. KRUMPELMANN

*St. Stephen's College, Columbia University*

## "WATER FASTAND"

Professor Strunk's note to line 352 of the *Secunda Pastorum* (MLN., March 1930, XLV, 151), explains the text more convincingly than does Dr. Adams (*Chief Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, p. 151, n. 1: "Fasting; thirsting for water?"), cautious as he is. Professor Strunk also points to the form in line 236, "lyys walteryng, by the roode, by the fyere, lo!" where the word is explained "lolling" (Adams, p. 149, n. 3) or "rolling or tossing about." (Cf. the modern *welter* and *waltz*.) That the form *water* might be a phonetic transcription of *walter*, Professor Strunk does not hint.

Many words which now have a voiced *l* were once pronounced without the *l* — such as *halter* (*King Lear*, I, iv, 343: cf. *N & Q*, clviii, 457) which rimes with *caught her*, *daughter*, *slaughter*, and *after*. Other formerly silent *l*'s are noted in *JEGP.*, January 1932,

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Grimm, and Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 10. Auflage, Berlin und Leipzig, 1924.

xxxI, 130-131: *realm, colts*, the rime *wote—fauhte—haulte* (*Ralph Roister Doister*, III, v, 38-40). The name *Ralph* (*Rafe*) is another example, and so is the Christian name *Walter*. In 2 *Henry VI*, iv, i, Suffolk is taken prisoner by a band of men which includes one Walter Whitmore. Upon hearing this name, Suffolk starts, and Whitmore asks

Why start'st thou? What, doth death  
affright?

*Suf.* Thy name affrights me, in whose sound is death.

A cunning man did calculate my birth

And told me that by water I should die:

Yet let not this make thee be bloody-minded;

Thy name is Gualtier, being rightly sounded.

*Whit.* Gualtier, or Walter, which it is, I care not.

The death of Suffolk at Whitmore's hand ends the scene. He died by Walter.

It is not impossible that when the scribe, who wrote the MS. of the *Secunda Pastorum*, copied "My foytt slepys, by Ihesus;/and I water fastand," he was spelling the word *walter* as it was pronounced. It is no unfamiliar phenomenon to find the same word spelled in more than one way, even in the same work, in Elizabethan times and earlier; the mania for standardization is of later growth.<sup>1</sup>

ROBERT WITHINGTON

*Smith College*

## A SECOND MS. OF WYCLIF'S *DE DOMINIO CIVILI*

J. Sullivan, in the *English Historical Review*, 1905, p. 293 f., noticed that the MS., Bibliothèque Nationale 15869 of Marsiglio of Padua's *Defensor Pacis* was bound up with a paper MS., "a tract entitled *De Dominio Civili Hominis*." Upon comparing this MS. with the text of Wyclif's *De civili dominio* as printed by the Wyclif Society, 1884, and edited by R. L. Poole I found it to be another.

<sup>1</sup> Frequently the presence of a silent *l* in words leads to its eventual pronunciation—cf. *golf*, which used to be (and still often is) pronounced "goff," at the same time that the *l* is creeping into the pronunciation. We all now say "fault," despite the Fr. *faute* (cf. L. *fallere*), though we do not pronounce the *b* in *doubt* which has crept in since Chaucer. The *c* in *perfect* is another letter which has established itself in the pronunciation.



MS. of Wyclif's work. Poole first edited the *De Civili Dominio* "from the unique manuscript at Vienna. . . . The three books *de civili Dominio* . . . are believed to exist only in a single copy, contained in two volumes and preserved in the imperial library at Vienna. . . . The . . . volume is written on vellum and bound in the original boards."

Dr. Poole studied the Vienna MS., and constructed his text from a transcript furnished by Dr. S. Herzberg-Fraenkel; he regretted that the text had to be made from the single manuscript. This Paris MS. has corrections, the word-order is not always the same as that of the Vienna text; some words in *Vienna* are not in *Paris*.

On fol. 103, top, after the *explicit* there follows "tractandum . . . 1381 16 Janii sedarum de Sorbona . . . magistrum," which localizes the MS., and gives an important date, also that of Berton's condemnation at Oxford.<sup>1</sup>

The paper of the MS., deserves notice, for the same kind is found in various libraries. It is heavy, with conspicuous watermarks, broad, horizontal and five vertical lines to a page. The watermark in the middle of the page varies: an animal (horse?), fol. 2; upside down, fol. 10; fleur-de-lys, upside down, fol. 15; crown with cross, fol. 19; flower, fol. 32; lamb and cross, fol. 62; hunting-horn, suspended, fol. 80; battle-axe, fol. 132. The sheets were carelessly put together, not in equal number. The paper is very like that of MS., Biblot. Nation. 14619 of the *Defensor Pacis*; and of MS., 1087 (Anc. fonds 342) in the municipal library of the Musée Calvert, Avignon: Ockam's *Tractatus de potestate* . . . assigned by the catalogue, Paris, 1894, i, p. 503, to the beginning of the Fifteenth Century.

The MS., Biblot. Nation., Paris, 14619 of the *Defensor Pacis* is bound up with *Articuli erronei Johs Wycleff heresiarche damnati Londiniis in Anglia a. do mccc. octagesimo*. The paper suggests MS., 15869, though not so coarse.

<sup>1</sup> If the Parisian faculty took Wyclif's book under advisement it should perhaps be reckoned with in the extraordinary demand they made upon the Clementine king in the following May for a general council. The *De Dominio Civili* is indeed highly doctrinaire, evangelical, impractical: it is not immediately connected with the Great Schism. Yet its discussion of Papal supremacy would be contributory to the determined arguments of the French professors in favor of a general council.

With MS. Biblot. Nation., 14620 of the *Defensor Pacis* is bound Gerson's *Tractus de potestate eccles. et de origine juris et legum*, drawn up for the Council of Constance, and dated Feb. vi, 1417 (fol. 137, verso); and the *Tractatus de jurisdictione eccles. potestatis* of Herv. Natalis.

In St. Mark's Library, Venice, MS., 2675, alternate vellum and paper, Wyclif's *Quaestiones* to fol. 58 are bound with John of Jandun's *Tractatus et quaestiones in Averrois*, ff. 61-96. The watermark is the same in both MSS., and the same as in

St. Mark's, Venice, 1553, a MS., of Petrarch's *Epist. fam. libri vi*. This MS. contains the *Litterae sine titulo* omitted by Fracassetti, but printed by Samuel Crispinus in his edition, Lyons, 1601. Crispin printed some sixty-five letters not in the Basle editions; but a collation of his text and this MS. showed many variations, in letter-headings, ascriptions, and *lacunae*—especially illustrated in Petrarch's letters to Colonna about the laureate.

Much has been written about watermarks, filigranes, wire-marks, the horizontal *vergueurs*, and the vertical 'spreaders,' or *pontuseaux*, and their significance and aid in dating a manuscript. Besides Girys's *Manuel de diplomatique*, Paris, 1894, and Prou's *Manuel de Paleographie*, Paris, 1924, the many studies by C.-M. Briquet, originally published in *Bibliographie moderne*, but reprinted separately and sold by H. Georg, Geneva, are useful to have on the ground.

Evidently, the notion of a community of doctrine between Marsiglio, John of Jandun and Wyclif was not limited to the bull and letters issued against Wyclif and sent to England from Sta. Maria Maggiore May 22, 1377 by Gregory XI. If Marsiglio's doctrines were among the *agenda* of the Council of Constance I find no mention of them in a secretary's record of the Council. Gerson and the French doctors would hardly bring up the name of the man who was the protagonist of the representative and conciliar idea. No one has yet shown textual indebtedness of Wyclif to Marsiglio; but the argument for some sort of secular control common to all three writers would be quite enough to link them together. From the manuscripts cited above this would seem to have been the case.

WM. PETERS REEVES

Kenyon College

---

BELPHEGOR IN GRIM THE COLLIER AND RICHE'S  
FAREWELL

The attractive comedy of *Grim the Collier of Croyden* is a clever interweaving of a number of strands, combining the tradition of Grim, "chief collier to the king's majesty's own mouth," with the legends of Saint Dunstan and of Robin Goodfellow, with Spenser's "Malbecco," and with the jest of the dumb wife cured, from the *Hundred Merry Tales*. These are minor elements. Printed in 1662, the play is presumably a revision of William Haughton's *The Devil and his Dame*, which Henslowe mentions in 1600, and finds its main plot in the story of Belphegor, the demon who married a wife to discover whether the damned were justified in unanimously blaming their wives for their consignment to hell. Machiavelli's *novella* has long been pointed out as the source, but the relation of the play to the *novella* needs a little clarification.

"The devil a married man" was evidently an oriental folk-tale originally. It is included in the *Çukasaptati*, the Turkish *Forty Vizirs*, and the *Thousand and One Nights*, and in recent times has been recorded from oral tradition in Egypt, Russia, Croatia, and Italy.<sup>1</sup> In literary form it first appeared in Europe in *Les Lamentations de Matheolus*, in the late thirteenth century.<sup>2</sup> In brief outline it occurs in the *Hecatomythium* of Lorenzo Abstemio (1505),<sup>3</sup> and later gives Hans Sachs material for a rhymed jest (1557).<sup>4</sup> As an Italian *novella* it was printed between 1545 and 1551 in several redactions which represented an original work by Machiavelli; and G. F. Straparola published an independent version of the tale, which was common property, in his *Tredici piacevoli notti*, 1550.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the bibliographical notes in Luigi Foscolo Benedetto, *Niccolò Machiavelli. Operette satiriche* (Torino, 1920), introd., esp. p. 4, n. 1. The Croatian tale has escaped such lists of the Belphegor story as I have seen. It is recorded by Dr. Fr. S. Krauss, *Sagen und Märchen der Südslaven* (Leipzig, 1884), II, 254.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. by A. G. van Hamel (Paris, 1892-1905), Book II, lines 3853-4034.

<sup>3</sup> In Book II, fable 95. Book I was published in 1495. Benedetto, *op. cit.*, p. 5, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Hans Sachs*, ed. Adelbert von Keller (1870-1908), IX, 284. "Schwank: Der teufel nam ein alts weib zu der eh."

<sup>5</sup> The fourth story for the second night.

In determining the source of *Grim the Collier* it will be useful to keep in mind several features of the play: the saint's vision of hell, the election of Belphegor and his mission to earth, his earthly name as Castiliano, and his proposed wife's name as Honorea. Comparison will then show the indebtedness of the play to Machiavelli, who includes the same incidents, the demon being Belphegor, his human name Roderigo di Castiglia, and his wife Honesta. In Straparola's similar tale there is no infernal council sending Belphegor on his mission; the demon is not identified with Belphegor but remains unnamed, as a demon; his earthly name is Pangrazio Stornello, and his wife is Silvia Ballastro.

The general similarity between the tales of Machiavelli and Straparola has led into a natural error almost every writer who has touched the subject of source, for we are told that *Grim the Collier* owes its plot to Barnabe Riche's translation of the Belphegor story in his *Farewell to Military Profession* (1581). Some scholars have asserted and others have implied that Riche translated Machiavelli,<sup>6</sup> but a comparison, with the characteristics mentioned before in mind, will show that Riche followed Straparola. The scene shifts to Scotland, but there is the same abrupt opening, omitting the vision of the council in hell; and the devil is named Balthaser, as man and demon, who weds mistress Mildred.<sup>7</sup> J. P. Collier noted the divergence from Machiavelli and so considered the tale the "most original part" of Riche's volume of translations.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> E. g., J. P. Collier *Eight Novels . . . by Barnaby Riche* (1846), being also Vol. I of *Early Prose and Poetical Tracts* (Shakespeare Soc., 1853), p. xvi; Emil Koeppl, "Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in der englischen Litteratur," *Quellen und Forschungen*, LXX (1892), 49, 99; E. Meyer, *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama* (Weimar, 1897), pp. 30 ff.; Mary A. Scott, "Elizabethan Translations from the Italian," Part I, *PMLA.*, x, 273; William E. A. Axon, "The Story of Belfagor in Literature and Folk-Lore," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, 2nd Ser., XXIII (1902), 108. Prof. Felix E. Schelling's statement is correct but might be misleading: "Machiavelli's novella is, however, the direct source of the main plot." Footnote: "The story of Belphegor was first translated into English by B. Riche in his *Farewell to the Military Profession*, 1581." *Elizabethan Drama 1558-1642* (Boston, 1908), I, 356.

<sup>7</sup> The chief differences between the Straparola-Riche tale and Machiavelli's are found in the later and major portion of the story, only the beginning of which was used by the playwright.

<sup>8</sup> Collier, *loc. cit.*

It should be plainly stated that Riche follows Straparola, and that the play follows Machiavelli in matters not contained in, or even suggested by, the Straparola-Riche version.

But to say that *Grim the Collier* is indebted to Machiavelli's *novella* is still indefinite, for the playwright might have used any of three different versions of the tale, printed by at least four different editors. According to Sig. Benedetto, the *novella* was probably an early work of Machiavelli, based partly on Matheolus. A manuscript copy in a hand identified as Machiavelli's exists, but it was never printed from directly until 1920. The story appeared in print first in Giovanni Brevio's *Rime et prose volgari*, 1545, eighteen years after Machiavelli's death, without ascription to Machiavelli. In 1549 Bernardo Giunti, in the first collected edition of Machiavelli's works, published a version differing in language from Brevio's, although otherwise similar. In 1551 A. F. Doni printed another version of the tale in his *Seconda libreria*, with the purpose, he said, of restoring the author's text and putting an end to such ridiculous mutilations as were appearing. He mentions Brevio, as he had done before in 1547, and hints at Giunti. The tale as he prints it differs at beginning and ending from Giunti's, which it otherwise resembles. Giunti's is closest to the existing manuscript.<sup>9</sup> Francesco Sansovino gave currency to Brevio's version by printing it in his *Cento novelle*, 1561.

Of the three versions, Doni's may be eliminated as the source of the play, for the altered beginning omits the vision of the saint, who becomes in the play the important character of Saint Dunstan.<sup>10</sup> Between the Giunti and Brevio versions there is little choice; the incidents of either could account for the play. But Brevio calls the wife Ermellina while Giunti names her Honesta, and the latter suggests the Honorea of the play. On this slight ground we may say that the play is a trifle closer to Giunti's version than to the others. We should therefore modify the usual statement, that *Grim the Collier* derives from Machiavelli through *Riche his Farewell to Militarie Profession*, and say that the play owes its main plot to Machiavelli's *novella* directly, no translation before 1600 being known; and probably to the version as printed by Giunti, or

<sup>9</sup> The various editions are described by Benedetto, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-18.

<sup>10</sup> Benedetto prints the Doni and Brevio versions in appendices.

as reprinted later in the John Wolfe ([London], 1588) or "Testina" editions of Machiavelli's works.<sup>11</sup>

D. W. THOMPSON

Cambridge, Massachusetts

---

## REVIEWS

---

*English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians.* Collected by CECIL J. SHARP. Edited by MAUD KARPELES. 2 vols. Pp. xxxvii + 436, xi + 411. [New York and] London: Oxford University Press, 1932. \$10.00.

*Ballads and Sea Songs of Newfoundland.* Collected and edited by ELIZABETH BRISTOL GREENLEAF. Music recorded in the field by GRACE YARROW MANSFIELD and the Editor. Pp. xli + 395. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933. \$5.00.

The two stout and handsome volumes of *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians* must not be confused with the single slimmer volume, now for some years out of print, that appeared under the same title in 1917 as the joint collection of Olive Dame Campbell and Cecil J. Sharp. Fortunately, all the material of the earlier edition, including Sharp's notable Introduction, reappears in the greatly enlarged recent publication. In place of the original 122 songs and ballads and 323 tunes, the new edition comprises 273 songs and ballads with 968 tunes—about three times the original amount. The new edition, like the old, is primarily a book of *songs*, without accompaniments, without elaborate annotation or critical discussion. Miss Karpeles has, however, supplied an admirably condensed Preface of nine pages, preluding Sharp's

<sup>11</sup> If I have read correctly Adolph Gerber, *Niccolò Machiavelli. Die Handschriften, Ausgaben, und Uebersetzungen seiner Werke* (Gotha, 1912), II, 83 ff., 90 ff., 92 ff., 98, there had been only two or three printings of the version probably used by the playwright before 1600. The Giunti text of 1549 was the basis of that printed by John Wolfe in London, in the volume of Machiavelli's works taking its title from *L'Asino d'oro*, 1588, with the false place-name Rome on the title-page; and the Wolfe text was the basis of the "Testina" edition, falsely dated 1550, but really printed between 1588 and 1619. The "Testina" edition may therefore have been later than the play. No translations before 1600 are recorded.

longer reprinted Introduction; she has added a few notes and a number of additional references, bringing the bibliography up to date; most important of all, she has been responsible for the selection and arrangement of the material from a much larger collection. All told, she has performed her large task effectively. Her share with Sharp in the original collecting of the material gives additional authority to her work as editor. The new *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians*, bearing the stamp of two such collector-editors and presenting as it does so generous a selection from the whole of Sharp's collections in America, takes its place at once in the forefront of the now numerous publications of American-English folk-song.

There would seem to be no just cause for any American scholar or local collector to feel aggrieved at this "intrusion" from without. Sharp was careful to respect the rights of established local collectors. His work in Virginia, for instance, was done with the cooperative approval of the Virginia Folk-lore Society, and he quite properly presented to the Society copies of all the ballad material he collected in the state. (It is to be regretted that not all later musician-collectors have in this honored the example of their master!) Sharp's collaboration with Mrs. Campbell is another instance of the same respect for established local collectors. In any case, the name of Cecil Sharp calls authoritative attention to the folk-song wealth of the Southern Appalachian region and adds that wealth immediately and definitively to the main stream of our English-speaking folk-song tradition.

Sharp's pioneer work, around the turn of the century and just after, as collector and interpreter of England's folk-songs, with emphasis on their musical character, is well known. Not until 1916 did he extend his collecting to America. Local collectors had just proved that the folk-singing tradition was more alive and vigorous in the Southern Appalachians than in England.

Sharp was evidently well pleased with what he found and delighted with the people he met, as, we may be sure, they were with him. His Introduction is a remarkable blend of the romantic travel sketch and a profound study of his subject. "Instead of having to confine my attention to the aged, as in England, where no one under the age of seventy ordinarily possesses the folk-song tradition," he says, "I discovered that I could get what I wanted from pretty nearly every one I met, young and old. In fact, I found myself for the first time in my life in a community in which singing was as common and almost as universal a practice as speaking." Melodies he found of characteristic charm and of absolute beauty. He lists a number, and Miss Karpeles adds to the list, of tunes that "will challenge the very finest of the folk-tunes that have been found in England." His system of modal classification,

explained in the Introduction, has been slightly revised in Miss Karpeles' Preface and has not been applied to all the later material.

This is not the place, nor this the reviewer, for a detailed musical analysis of the content of the volume. The 55 ballads of the earlier edition have become 72, the 55 songs have become 135, the dozen nursery songs have become 27, and three new classes are added, including 5 hymns, 15 jigs, and 20 play-party games. The 37 Child ballads of the earlier book have become 45, and in each case these are given the position of honor; but Sharp early recognized as fully as such later commentators as Professor Gerould that *ballad* has a broader meaning than some Child enthusiasts allow.

The make-up of the volumes recognizes the equal importance and the inseparability of text and tune. Thus these two musical scholars from the Old World, Sharp and Miss Karpeles, again come forward to redress the balance of a long too insistent emphasis, in this country, on the academic and textual study of folk-songs. It should be added that in general American folk-song scholars now recognize their past limitations and are doing their utmost to secure for the music of their songs adequate representation and competent treatment.

The ideal folk-song specialist would be a remarkable combination of varied abilities. He should be a competent scholar, a technically trained musician, an active collector in the field, and a man of good literary taste—to say nothing of those qualities of personality that will enable him to get along with all types of people. This ideal combination has never been achieved, unless it was in Cecil Sharp, who perhaps most nearly approached it. The essential antagonism, in this country at any rate, seems to be between music and scholarship. Our scholars have seldom been musicians, and still less have our musicians been scholars. Good conservatories we have had, which produce good performers, men of rich temperament and admirable technical knowledge. But there is little or no tradition in this country for the disciplined study of music at the university level, for the recognition of musical study, including even its technical side, as a legitimate interest of the well-rounded man and of the specialized scholar who has no intention of becoming a professional singer, pianist, or violinist. In a word, we have produced few musicologists. In this state of things, folk-song scholars, finding their technical musical equipment inadequate, must continue to co-opt the musical assistance they need. The day has passed when scholars could afford to ignore or subordinate the music of folk-songs; the day has not yet arrived when folk-song scholarship can with safety be turned over to the musicians.

*Ballads and Sea Songs from Newfoundland*, the latest addition to the Harvard University Press series of folk-song collections, is a good example of the successful co-opting of more expert musical assistance by a collector-editor primarily the literary enthusiast.



scholar, though with some musical competence. As the Vassar College Folk-lore Expedition to Newfoundland in 1929, Mrs. Greenleaf and Mrs. Mansfield completed the collecting begun in 1920 by Mrs. Greenleaf, when she was a summer volunteer teacher for Dr. Wilfred Grenfell's Mission. They have brought together a rich garner of varied material, and their editing, which is mainly Mrs. Greenleaf's, has done justice to the material.

The Newfoundland volume, as might be expected, most closely resembles Mackenzie's collection of *Ballads and Sea Songs from Nova Scotia*. The chief difference between the two concerns the music. The earlier volume printed 42 tunes for 162 ballads and songs. The more recent publication prints 99 tunes to 185 ballads and songs, and in addition 14 dance tunes (7 quadrilles, 3 cotillion figures, 2 jigs, and 2 step dances). What is more significant, the tunes, with the interwoven words of the first stanza, are printed in the body of the book along with the text, in the approved Sharp fashion, not relegated to an appendix as in the Nova Scotia and many other earlier volumes. It is clear that collectors and editors are doing their utmost to secure the music and to recognize its importance even in the method of printing.

The Newfoundland songs are very varied in character, running the gamut from 19 Child ballads, through many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century broadside ballads, to nineteenth- and even twentieth-century songs, many of them locally as well as recently composed. Apparently it does not take so long to make a folk-song as many people think, and folk-songs are still being made as well as imported. In Newfoundland the importations are chiefly from the British Isles, especially England and Ireland, secondarily from America and Canada. Though their borrowings continue, the Newfoundlanders themselves have composed not a few songs celebrating local happenings, and their manner of life gives a distinctive character to their choice of songs.

Upon the whole, however, one is impressed with the similarity of the songs known in the several singing localities on this side of the Atlantic. There are, of course, minor variations: Newfoundland naturally has more sea songs than the Southern Appalachians, a larger Irish element in place of the Southern Scotch, perhaps more interest (or is it simply more collectors' interest?) in songs commemorating local happenings, and there is a difference in the style of singing, variant melodies, variant words, as always in folk tradition. Yet the resemblances of the folk-song traditions of various localities are more striking. Songs have apparently seeped in and out of the several singing regions with surprising alacrity, and, though each region contributes a few distinctive rarities (such as "The Bonny Banks of the Virgie, O" and "The Unquiet Grave" from Newfoundland), much the same repertoire has found favor with singing folk in Newfoundland, in Nova Scotia, in

Maine, in the Southern Appalachians, and even in the Ozarks. This is natural, since, with some minor reservations, all these folk singers are carriers and continuators of the British tradition. The several singing regions are in effect far-separated portions of a single folk-song locality. In the essentials of folk culture it is not so far as the geographers say from Newfoundland to the Southern Appalachians.

ARTHUR KYLE DAVIS, JR.

*University of Virginia*

---

*Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations.* By GUDMUND SCHÜTTE. Vol. I, pp. xi + 288; vol. II, pp. xvi + 482. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929-1933; New York: The Macmillan Co., \$16.

The first volume of this encyclopedic work is a translation (made by Jean Young) of Dr. Schütte's *Vor Folkegruppe Gottjod* (Copenhagen, 1926). The second volume seems to have had no Danish original; in his Preface Dr. Schütte says only that "the English of the author's MS. has been revised by Miss Winifred Husbands." The work may be described as a highly systematic ethnological survey of classical and post-classical Germania. It goes with such works as Zeuss's *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, and is the only thing of its kind to be had in English. The author rejects the term *Germanic* in favor of *Gothonic*; hence the "Gothonic" of his title.

Apart from an introductory section of nine pages on the Indo-Europeans, vol. I is devoted to a general description of the Gothonic nations as a group. This great ethnic unit is considered under eight heads: name (pp. 10-37), subdivision (pp. 37-53), ethnic position (pp. 53-59), environment (60-137), old home (138-147), language (147-197), civilization (198-238) and history (238-253). Vol. II is devoted to the individual Gothonic tribes, which are taken up by sub-groups. Under each sub-group we are given, first, a description of the sub-group as a whole; next, a description of the sub-group by branches. The individual tribes which make up a given branch are considered in the course of the description of that branch. The eight heads used in vol. I are reduced to four (name, subdivision, ethnic position and history) in vol. II, but a ninth head (legendary traditions) is added. The author explains (p. xiii) that the missing heads were left untreated "owing to the lack of expert collaboration." He envisages his work as "a methodical framework, showing how the detailed information expected in an ethnic manual *should be arranged*." He adds, with a modesty blunting to the weapons of the critic, "the details themselves are

of very unequal quality." Each volume has a good index, and a bibliography is appended to vol. II. By way of illustration, 10 plates or figures appear at the end of the first volume; 20, at the end of the second.

Schütte's work will prove exceedingly valuable as an introduction to Germanic (or Gothonic) ethnology; in particular, his systematic presentation of the material will make it easier for the student to find his way about. One may legitimately object, however, to the author's boldness of interpretation in many a dubious matter. Such boldness is proper enough in a learned article or monograph, but out of place in a manual, meant to serve primarily as a guide for students and a work of reference. Since limitations of space forbade detailed discussion of moot points, theoretical constructions and far-fetched hypotheses ought to have been avoided, or, if touched upon, brought forward with due reservation. In the following I will point out a few cases of this kind, together with this and that in which I find myself at odds with my distinguished colleague.

Pp. 23 and 31: *philology* seems to be used in the sense 'definition of a word.' P. 33: Schütte's interpretation of the *epel Gotena* of *Widsith* 109 is hardly right; cf. *Widsith* 122. P. 54: one is astonished to read that "there seems to be general agreement on the fact that the Gothonic nations are a race of tall, fair long-skulls, whose mental characteristic is their organizing power and skill, as is apparent from the dynasties throughout Europe at the present day." P. 67: *Skotta* is surely not "a Gothic personal name." P. 77: the initial vowel in OE. *Estmere* is short; see my paper in *Speculum*, VIII, 67 ff. P. 81 footnote: why bring in the Swedes? P. 104: it is depressing to find Schütte not only clinging to such discredited equations as Hlīpe = Chlodio, but actually bringing them forward without a hint that their validity had been called in question. P. 191: Jespersen has made doubtful the existence in OE. of a feminine suffix *-ster* (*MLR.*, XXII, 131 ff.). P. 241: Pytheas never "visited the Teutones near the Prussian amber coast." P. 251: the expedition of Hygelac took place some years later than A. D. 515; see R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf, An Introduction* (ed. of 1921, pp. 381 f.; ed. of 1932, pp. 383 ff.). Vol. II, pp. 12 and 27: we have no evidence that King Alfred's *Witland* is an OHG. form. P. 31: Heoden, the foe of Hagena, could hardly have been an object of worship among the Rugians! P. 34: Heorrenda was a scop, not a leader of the Heodeningas. P. 69: the ancestors of the English nation were not "Germanized" at all, whether in the ninth century or at any other time. P. 108: the North Swabians play no part in the OE. legends of the Migration Age; the Swæfe of *Widsith* are the Eider-Suebi (see Hoops *Reallex* s. v.). P. 127: the Witta of *Widsith* 22 is in no way "connected with the persons of the Hjaðning Legend." Pp. 180, 214, 250: the

Quadi of Zosimus were presumably Suebi, not Chauci; since Zosimus makes them a branch of the Saxons, we may well connect them with the Eider-Suebi. P. 244: the Normans who followed Duke William in 1066 were Frenchmen, not Scandinavians. P. 314: *Angelþeow* is not *Angelþeod*, in spite of Schütte's *i. e.*; Eomær is not named in *Beowulf*, though emendators have inserted his name in the text; Offa does not marry the widow of Hygelac! The chronological problem in *Widsith* is not properly put in the statement that "*Widsith* unhesitatingly makes Ostrogotha who lived about 250 shake hands with Albuin who lived about 550." This statement gives us likewise a good illustration of the troubles which beset a foreigner when he tries to write in English. P. 324: Hunlaf is not mentioned in *Beowulf*, though a sword-name *Hunlafing* occurs; Ordlaſ and Guþlaſ are named in *Finnsburg* 16; there is no statement in *Finnsburg* that Sigeferþ is ruler of the Secgan; on the contrary, he is represented as a *wrecca* 'adventurer' who has taken service with Hnæf; the Sæferð of *Widsith* 31 is therefore not to be identified with the Sigeferþ, *Secgena leod* 'man of the Secgan' referred to in *Finnsburg*, though the two may well have been kinsmen. I cannot agree with Schütte that Pliny's *Gutones* is a corrupt form; see my paper in *Namn och Bygd*, xxii, 34 ff. P. 363: Hengest and Horsa were presumably Eider-Suebi, not Jutes, if the genealogies can be trusted. P. 372: *Widsith* 22 is to be connected not with the preceding but with the following line; lines 22 f. make up a couplet. Pp. 375 f.: the sketch of early Danish history here given is not in agreement with our oldest monuments, viz., *Widsith*, *Beowulf* and the *Bjarkamál*; Schütte seems to prefer the latest and least trustworthy monuments in making his reconstruction of the course of events. P. 412: there is no sound basis for the identification of Eanmund and Eadgils with the Homothus and Hogrimus of Saxo.

KEMP MALONE

*The Johns Hopkins University*


---

*Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im Beowulfepos.* Von LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING. Abhandlungen der philol.-hist. Kl. der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Band XLII, Nr. V. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1933. Pp. iv + 46.

In this profound study of Old Germanic—especially Old English—heroic philosophy Professor Schücking selects a few traits of heroic behaviour, traits striking, even offensive to the modern mind, words insufficiently understood, and shows how they all are part and parcel of the heroic attitude towards life. The gist

of the heroic philosophy is glorification of one's self, a superb individualism which employs every possible means to the perfection of one's life. Many things enter into the ideal of a heathen hero: noble birth, strength of body and mind, faith in the follower, liberality in the leader, especially the king, wisdom and unswerving courage under all circumstances, but the most priceless possession of the hero is fame, OE *dōm*, the admiring judgment of men near and far, in space and time alike. Nowhere has this been more pointedly expressed than in the famous stanzas (77.78) of *Hávamál*:

*Deyr fé, deyja frændr,  
deyr sjálfr it sama;  
enn orðstírr deyr aldregi  
hveim er sér góðan getr.*

and:

*Deyr fé, deyja frændr  
deyr sjálfr it sama;  
ek veit einn at aldri deyr:  
dómr um dauðan hvern.*

It seems strange that Prof. Schücking should not mention this well-known parallel to the OE *dōm*, which he discusses on p. 14. One might, indeed, think that he had been avoiding the obvious, if it did not appear in other places that he left out Old Icel. parallels even to the detriment of his argumentation. Thus, in trying to establish a new meaning for the OE *gylp*, he quotes parallels from Homer and from the Old Indian heroic poetry, not to speak of the German *Hildebrandslied* and *Walthari-lied* but he leaves the "flytings" of the *Edda* entirely out of the picture, although they are almost perfect illustrations of the meaning he wants to see in *gylp*.<sup>1</sup>

That such ignoring of the Old Icelandic material is unfortunate is best shown by Schücking's discussion of the word *beot*. For it is not only true, as he says, that until now the difference in meaning between *beot* and *gylp* has been insufficiently understood; it is also safe to say that the word *beot*, in spite of its known etymology (< *bihāt*), has generally been poorly understood. "Boast" and "boasting" have been the traditional English translation of the word. However, anybody acquainted with the well-attested custom of *heitstrenging* in Icelandic literature could not fail to see in the *beot* passages of *Beowulf* and the *Battle of Maldon* essentially the same custom.<sup>2</sup> This was already recognized by Nyrop, "En middel-

<sup>1</sup> *Helga kviða Hundingsbana*, II, 22 and *Helga kv. Hund.*, I, 33-44: a flyting between Guðmundr Granmarsson and Sinfjötli before the battle. They vie in vilification of each other, until Helgi stays Sinfjötli with the remark that it were more seemly for them to fight than to spend their strength in wasting vain words. Cf. Schücking, p. 9, note 2.

<sup>2</sup> Probably the best-known example of *heitstrenging* is the vows made by the famous *Jómsvíkingar* at the funeral feast given by Sveinn tjúguskegg

alderlig 'Skik' (Nordisk Tidskrift, utg. af Letterstedtska föreningen. xii, 1889)—forty-four years before Schücking's study—and Schücking might well have called attention to the fact when he quoted Nyrop.

According to Schücking (p. 8) *beot* is used before the comrades, *gylp* before the adversary; common to both is the reference to one's own glorious deeds. *Gylp*—etymologically connected with *yell*—is the loud denunciation of the enemy, combined with boasting of your own deeds, a procedure designed to fill yourself with courage for the coming fight. This ingenious interpretation of *gylp* is based on one passage in *Beowulf* only (v. 2528). In an article, which has recently appeared in *PMLA*. (Dec., 1934, pp. 975-993), I did not venture further than to assert that *bēot* stressed the promise and *gylp* the boast, but this difference was not very clear in the sources. Actually the words mean the same in most cases. But even if Schücking were not right in his interpretation of the *Beowulf* passage, I am inclined to agree with him that this was the original meaning of the word in view of its etymology and the well-documented custom of flyting in the *Edda* and elsewhere.

Schücking's confrontation of the heathen ideal of life with the Christian one is both felicitous and instructive. His method is to show how some words, like *gylp*, *wlencu*, which are *epitheta ornantia* in paganism, sink down to the level of derogatory words in the Christian ideology. Pride and self-respect had to be bent under the Christian yoke of humility. Nothing shows better than the constant hammering of the clergy on this very virtue of humility how stubborn were the necks of the heathen, and how innate in them was the ideal of proud dignity. Another term, not mentioned by Schücking, serves to illustrate this. It is the word *wine* as applied to the king and his retainer, e. g., *Beowulf* 30, 1418, or in the compound *winedryhten*. It means that—originally at any rate—the bond between king and retainer was one of friendship first and foremost (cf. the relationship between the Icelandic *goði* and his *þingmenn*). That the attitude of the heathen to his god was somewhat similar may, perhaps, be inferred from the numerous instances in the Icelandic sagas where a person is said to be a great friend of his special god (*þórr*, *Freyr* etc.), or *vice versa*. Well known is the story of Hrafnkell Freysgoði and his horse, Faxi: *Hann gaf Frey, vin sínum, þann hest hálfan* "he gave to his friend Frey that horse half." Frey is his friend, not his lord, and of humility on Hrafnkell's part there is no trace: as soon as he thinks that Frey has deserted him, he breaks with him for good.

in honor of his father Haraldr Gormsson (cf. *Heimskringla*, transl. by Morris and Magnússon, i, 271-273). The whole episode of the *Jómsvíkingar* of late has come in for severe criticism by historians (Weibull), but none has noticed that the seemingly romantic tale of the feast and its wild vows receives the best support from the contemporary and fully authentic *Battle of Maldon*.

In an *Anhang* Schücking discusses the technic of characterization employed in *Beowulf*. Here he shows that many of the things which seem awkward and inopportune to the modern reader are by no means slips of the poet, but are actually intended by him to convey certain impressions. Here, too, he traces the individual facts back to their source in the poet's philosophy of life. Interesting is his remark (p. 31) that in OE society (*Beowulf*) youth did not enjoy the same esteem as maturity, and this, he thinks, is a Christian trait, for it seems to be foreign to the Scandinavian world. There is perhaps something in this, cf. the OE rank of *ealdorman*, known in O. Danish, but not in Norwegian-Icelandic (A. Bugge, *Studier over de norske byers selvstyre og handel*, p. 84 (Kria, 1899).). Icelandic sagas also contain numerous instances of precociousness, but on the other hand there are such examples as Njáll with his many sons, who, unruly as they are, always submit to his bidding, and who, though grown up and married, continue to live at their father's house. It seems to be a real instance of patriarchy.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

*The Johns Hopkins University*

*Geoffrey Chaucer and the Development of his Genius.* By JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934. Pp. x + 246. \$2.50.

Mr. Lowes' study of Chaucer was not prepared for specialists. It has a definitely popular appeal and, like G. K. Chesterton's illuminating criticism of the poet, will have a far-reaching influence in bringing Chaucer somewhat nearer his due in both England and America. The book consists of five lectures, "printed essentially as they were delivered" (p. vii) at Swarthmore College in 1932. The requirement that these lectures be published as lectures precluded references and notes, and there is no index. It is slightly unorthodox to examine from the scholarly point of view lectures which are unpretentious in scholarship. Lowes, however, is one of the few men whose lectures admit and even welcome such treatment. Those on *Convention and Revolt in Poetry* are of the stuff which makes the bed-rock of modern criticism; those which form the heart of *The Road to Xanadu* represent a landmark in literary scholarship; and Chaucerians will look to Lowes' latest book as a portion of their heritage. They may regret that the lectures had to be published simply as lectures, and that the years of great research, the powerful understanding, and the zest for life embodied in this book could not have made a study comparable to that on Coleridge's genius—to which Lowes indeed was led while

intent upon Chaucer himself. Such regret is not mitigated by the inclusive nature of the title, which suggests that here are Lowes' final dicta upon the poet.

Since the lectures are not primarily for students of Chaucer, they naturally involve much that is not new. Mr. Lowes himself expresses distaste for his summaries of such poems as *Troilus and Criseyde*; many of the comments on the minor poetry are time-worn, even though imperishable. At times readers must have an intimate acquaintance with Chaucerian research to distinguish fact from opinion. A case in point is the statement (pp. 55-56) that when in 1373 Chaucer returned from Florence to England "he carried with him manuscripts of Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch." From this first Italian journey, surely, dates Chaucer's knowledge of Dante's work, but not necessarily of the writings of the other two. Unless the *Parliament of Fowls* came before the second journey (1378)—and the classical later dating has not been thoroughly shaken—Chaucer may not have read even the *Teseide* before that time; and a knowledge of Boccaccio's other works and of Petrarch's does not appear before Chaucer's mission to Milan. There, in 1378, he visited the court of generous patrons of learning with whom Petrarch had resided eight years and where Bernabò Visconti had an extensive library. I plan later to elaborate on Chaucer's possible literary gains from this "God of delit," but for the present I wish only to suggest that perhaps Chaucer did not obtain manuscripts of Boccaccio and Petrarch in 1373. Mr. Lowes' assertion need never affect general readers; but like an error in detail on page 95, where the first "1388"<sup>1</sup> should read "1368," it discourages students from looking here for factual knowledge.

Of course it is not for such matters that they will read this book, nor to be told (p. 195) the framework of the *Decameron* is static, nor for the attempts to enliven Chaucer's reputation by means of humor at the expense of Machaut and Gower. They will rather note that in retelling established comments regarding Chaucer's life, times, and work, Lowes has for the most part taken the point of view of the fourteenth century and with his wealth of erudition and wisely human tone has restored much of the atmosphere of the poet's day. Chaucer is presented as a man of affairs and a reader of books, and the influences which promoted the growth of his poetical power are vividly elucidated. Familiar lines obtain rich meaning, and characters come to life. One sees the pathetically ironic situation of Pandarus, and the womanliness of Criseyde. As the pilgrims take the Canterbury road, Harry Bailey becomes their *Chorus*; the company and their tales alike glow with vitality and color. Chaucer is Mr. Lowes' "oune bok"; and in his arduous

<sup>1</sup> That this "1388" is not a typographical error is shown by its second mention as "this same 1388," in reference to an occurrence in that year.



scholarship Lowes has never forgotten that research is not merely anatomical, but can be justified only when in the end it restores the breath of life.

ROBERT ARMSTRONG PRATT

*The University of Rochester*

*The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature.*

By WILLIAM O. WEHRLE. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1933. Pp. xxxvii + 186.

The Macaronic element in English poetry has so far failed to receive a thorough and comprehensive treatment. Dr. Wehrle has taken the Macaronic lyric of the Old and Middle English periods for the subject of his dissertation for the Ph. D. in English at the Catholic University of America. "I have," he states in his preface, . . . "narrowed down the topic of macaronic poetry to these religious lyrical effusions, not neglecting, however, the few political, ironic, and convivial poems that conform to the general macaronic traditions of the hymns investigated. I shall attempt likewise to show that the Latin interlacings in these poems are for the most part borrowings from the hymns or liturgical prayers of the Church." Since this statement represents what Dr. Wehrle has actually set out to do in his study, I wish that he had been more fortunate in the choice of his title. It is not sufficiently inclusive.

After a rather diffuse introduction follow brief chapters on 'The Old English Period,' 'The Thirteenth Century,' and 'The Fourteenth Century.' Then follow two longer chapters on 'The Fifteenth Century' and 'Lydgate and Ryman.' Dr. Wehrle divides the poems into thirteen types according to the placing of the 'macaronic' elements. Though the work of mechanical classification is done carefully, Dr. Wehrle would have produced a better study if he had made more use of condensation and had gone more thoroughly into the subject. I fear he is sweeping too large a field—a field large enough for at least two dissertations, I should say.

Turning to details, I wish to call attention to some questionable statements and to some important bibliographical omissions. Did Lactantius write the Latin *Phoenix* (p. 2) and did Cynewulf write the Anglo-Saxon *Phoenix* (p. 6)? In his treatment of the 'Anglo-Norman Drinking Song' (pp. 19-27), Dr. Wehrle would have profited by the use of Eero Ilvonen, *Parodies de Thèmes pieux dans la poésie française du Moyen Age* (Helsingfors, 1914) and the critical edition of the poem by Gaston Paris (*Romania*, XXI, 262); Paul Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter* (München, 1922); Joseph Bédier, *Les Fabliaux*; and Francesco Novati 'La parodia sacra nelle letterature moderne' (*Studi Critici e Letterari*, Torino,

1889). Carleton Brown's excellent edition of *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford, 1932) appeared too late for use in this study, I suppose. Statements made by Dr. Wehrle on pages 32 and 33 would be modified after an examination of Poem 17 in Brown. The poem in Harley MS. 2253 (Wehrle, p. 43) is assigned by Brown to the thirteenth century (See Brown, Poem 87).

The hymn from which the line *Consurgat Christus tumulto* is taken Dr. Wehrle says he was unable to find (pp. 131-132). The next to the last stanza of Hymn CIX in A. S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns* (Cambridge University Press, 1922) begins with this line. This hymn beginning *Ad cenam agni providi* was formerly "assigned to Vespers at Easter, but in the modern Roman breviary in its rewritten form *Ad regias agni dapes* it is appointed for the First Sunday after Easter (*dominica in albis*)" (Walpole, *op. cit.*, p. 349).

MILLETT HENSHAW

St. Louis University

*The English Folk-Play.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 248. \$3.75.

This volume deals especially with the Mummers' Play and its congeners: the Plough Play, the Sword Dance, and the Morris Dance. The important studies of Tiddy and Baskervill and many additional texts of the folk-plays have become available since Chambers wrote *The Mediaeval Stage*, and accordingly he now reviews the whole subject with the help of this new material. His conclusions, in brief, are that the Mummers' Play and its associates represent the survivals of a primitive European *ludus* of a ceremonial type performed in the spring to bring good luck to fields and flocks; that into this ritualistic, agricultural *ludus*—the central features of which were a mock death and revival—there crept various fragments of folk custom; that upon the play there was grafted, not earlier than the end of the sixteenth century and perhaps later, a text which became traditional and which was in large measure derived from Richard Johnson's *Famous Historie of the Seaven Champions of Christendom*; and that, finally, this text in its various surviving versions is liberally farced with literary accretions dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

For the author's presentation of widely scattered versions of the plays, for his keen analyses of their conflations and interrelations, and for his documentation of such early references to the plays as exist, all students of the drama will be grateful. Moreover, those interested in the problems of oral transmission may here observe many a posited phenomenon in actual operation. For example, in

one community or another, the mummers are known as mummies, the Pasch Egg is a Pace Egg, and the line, "Activity of youth, activity of age" becomes "Act Timothy of youth, act Timothy of age." The latest recruit to the traditional group of characters—which includes, it will be remembered, Saint George and the Turkish Knight—is introduced with the words, "In steps I, a suffragette."

It is the author's conjectures for the period antecedent to the sixteenth century—a period for which he must necessarily depend upon subjective reasoning—that will arouse most controversy. His evidence (pp. 165 ff.) for connecting the Doctor of the Mummers' Play with the Spice-Merchant of the religious drama seems to me tenuous. (Incidentally, the Spice-Merchant appears in the liturgical plays at least a century earlier than C. assumes; cf. K. Young, *The Drama of the Mediaeval Church*, I, 678.) Other debatable points are the suggested analogue of the "beheading game" in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (p. 161), the potential parallels in the moralities (pp. 163 ff.), the statement that "the name 'Fool' derives from the Latin *folis*, a wind-bag, through the puffed cheeks of *mimi*" (p. 225) and the assumption of an independent Wooing Play of late origin (p. 235).

Criticism of the author's investigations into the remoter origins of the Mummers' Play—its possible connections with modern Balkan festivals, primitive ritual and Frazer's *Golden Bough*—must be left to professional folklorists. Those who have found Chambers' past judgments so frequently vindicated by the discovery of new evidence will doubtless feel that in the woods of unverifiable hypotheses he is as safe and sensible a guide as any man. At all events there is no question but that his book is the best in its field.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*Brittons Bowre of Delights*, 1591. Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xxvi + 116. \$4.00.

This book, a collotype facsimile of the unique copy in the Huntington Library, is not printed merely as a literary curiosity; to help us restore *The Bower* to its rightful place among Elizabethan miscellanies, Professor Rollins has supplied a brief but inclusive introduction, interesting annotations, and variant readings. *The Bower* was published without Nicholas Breton's consent. Protesting with some heat against the liberty taken by the printer, Richard Jones, and acknowledging only "Amoris Lachrimae" and a few other "toies," Breton was no doubt too inclusive

in his disclaimer of authorship, for many of the poems appear to be his work. They are uneven in merit, and abound in the conventions of Elizabethan "conceited" verse,—paradoxes, acrostics, stiff similes. A fair estimate of the book could be made by comparing the poem "Of his Mistresse loue" (p. 21), reasonably typical of *The Bower*, with Lyly's song "Cupid and my Campaspe." "Amoris Lachrimae," the first and longest poem in the volume, is an elegy on Sir Philip Sidney, who is celebrated further in several short pieces. Complimentary acrostics, love poems, songs about Cupid, and "complaints" account for most of the contents.

In his introduction, Professor Rollins gives some account of the history of the unique copy of the first edition; describes the second edition (1597), of which only two copies survive; presents the evidence concerning Breton's relations with printer Jones; notes the changes in content in the second edition of *The Bower* and the related parts of *The Arbor of Amorous Devices*; discusses Jones's editorial practices; touches upon the question of Breton's authorship; and lists interesting points in vocabulary and metrics. The chief merit of the notes is the skillful tracing of the history of the poems in other anthologies, both manuscript and printed. In this field Professor Rollins is very much at home, and he gives a lucid and interesting account of the variant forms of the poems.

Generally satisfactory as they are, the introduction and notes are not free from error. We are told (p. xxv) that "Sir Egerton Brydges, editing Phillips's *Theatrum* in 1800, as well as *Excerpta Tudoriana* in 1814, apparently did not even know *The Bower* by title." But Brydges, planning to reedit the *Theatrum*, printed in both editions of *Censura Literaria* (2nd ed., III, 406) some supplementary notes sent him by a correspondent, including one on the 1591 *Bower*. He makes another reference to the book in his edition of *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, 1810, p. xiii (*British Bibliographer*, III). A few notes are superficial; the reader who would not be bothered by obvious misprints (p. 63) would hardly need to have "thou winnest the golden ball" explained: "That is, for beauty, as Venus won the golden apple by the judgment of Paris" (47.32 on p. 99).

Professor Rollins is content with a general and not altogether consistent account of the biographical and literary relationships of the Sidney poems. In his preface to the first edition of *Astrophel and Stella*, 1591, Nashe makes a scornful allusion to *The Bower*, which Professor Rollins cites (p. xxiv) as the first contemporary reference to this collection. If Nashe's remark about "Pan sitting in his bower of delights" refers to Breton's work, then obviously *Astrophel and Stella* follows *The Bower* in order of publication, and should not be included in the note on "Whose workes are extant to the worlde" (25.23 on p. 84). The point is not a mere quibble, but bears directly on Breton's knowledge of

the poems and their probable meaning. Would he have known them at all prior to their publication? Professor Rollins could have argued plausibly for an acquaintance with the sonnet sequence from Breton's relations with the Countess of Pembroke, but overlooking the question of order of publication, he takes that knowledge for granted. Consequently he annotates the line "In all the skie he honoured but a starre" as a reference to Penelope Rich (7.26 on p. 71), and makes no comment on the highly conventional "Phillis" (13.28) who laments her shepherd's end. Nashe's allusion, Breton's association with Sidney's sister, Breton's poems on Sidney, and his acrostic on Penelope Rich (p. 19), not preserved elsewhere, need a more precise integration with our knowledge of Sidney than they receive here.

The textual work is sometimes disappointing in its limitations. The listing of variant readings runs too strongly to typographical errors, like the frequent confusion of *r* and *t*, for literary purposes; and the selective treatment of the orthographical changes and the exclusion of punctuation variants make the notes inadequate for bibliographical purposes. Apparently some changes which may very well affect the meaning are excluded as mere variations in spelling. To give but one example, in "Amoris Lachrymae" a line which reads "And for my selfe to see thee wo begone thee" (10.24) becomes in the 1597 edition "And for my selfe to see the wo begune thee," a change which is not noted at all. Again, the complete exclusion of punctuation variants obscures the fact that the 1597 *Bower* occasionally makes an improvement, as on p. 13, l. 18, where a comma is correctly substituted for a period at the end of the line. A less, rather than more, elaborate textual apparatus (but one less mechanically limited in scope) would be appropriate for this particular text. The examples I have given are fairly representative of the results of arbitrary exclusion.

I have noted very few misprints: p. xiv, read *Cütrey* for *Cutrey*; p. 64 (11.17) read *griefe* for *griefel*; p. 83 (25.16) read *and*<sup>2</sup> for *and*. It is more of a compliment than an injustice to Professor Rollins that I have stated the virtues of his edition in sentences, and the faults, in some instances bordering on differences of opinion, in paragraphs. The variety of the materials in this little miscellany required and received a corresponding variety in treatment, and the student generally will find the critical treatment adequate either as a self-contained explanation or as a starting point for more detailed study.

ERNEST A. STRATHMANN

Pomona College

*The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey.* Edited by CYRUS LAURENCE DAY.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. x + 168.  
\$2.50.

A book on D'Urfey has been so long overdue that Professor Day's work is assured of a welcome. His Introduction includes an admirable life of the poet, containing much new matter, for which all students of the period will be grateful; a considered appraisal of his long-forgotten works, which included plays, operas, satires, fables and tales; and a discussion of his once-famous songs, by which alone his diminished name survives.

The importance of D'Urfey in his day and generation cannot be questioned. He was pre-eminent as a song-writer for some forty years; his lyrics (there were in all nearly five hundred of them) were everywhere sung, by king and courtier, citizen and apprentice, squire and yokel; and sixty years after his death many of them still held their place in public affection.

The editor has chosen and reprinted twenty-six of "the most meritorious, the most popular, and the most typical" of D'Urfey's songs; and few will be able to quarrel with his choice. One student here and there may wish some substitution of pieces—would in so restricted a collection gladly have spared, for instance, the long anecdotal ballad (twenty-one stanzas *plus* chorus) for two or three such charming things as: "Sweet, use your time," "Was it some Cherubin," or, "I Follow'd Fame," which find no place here; but that kind of criticism is almost inevitable with a book of selections.

The words of the songs are accompanied by facsimiles of their original musical settings, the work of various contemporary composers—Purcell, Blow, and others—among whom D'Urfey himself figures. The poet was proud of his musical capacity; indeed, in the Dedication of *Songs Compleat*, Vol. I, 1719, he roundly asserted that his peculiar fitness for the compilation of that famous collection lay in his "double Genius for Poetry and Musick." It is therefore a little surprising that so few of his tunes should have been discovered. Professor Day has been able to unearth two only (one of which he prints), and says: "There is no authority for the attribution of any other extant tunes to D'Urfey." In the British Museum, however, there is a third which has escaped his scrutiny: a single sheet containing the words and music of "One Sunday at St. James's prayers," the heading of which quite definitely states: "A New Song Sett by Mr. Tho. Durfey" (H. 1601, 338).

Professor Day also furnishes in the Notes "a bibliographical account" of each song included by him. These lists of reprints of the songs reveal, as nothing else could do, their long-continued popularity. Nevertheless, the songs were in much greater demand than is shown even in these bibliographies. A single example will suffice:

the song, "We all to conqu'ring Beauty bow," is cited as having been reprinted thirteen times between D'Urfey's death and 1790. That number can be almost trebled. In addition to the books or editions listed, the song also appeared in *The Hive*, 1724, and *ibid.*, Vol. I, 1726; *The Choice*, 1729, and *ibid.*, Vol. I, 1732; *The Lark*, 1740, and 1742; *The Merry Companion*, 1742; *The Aviary* [1744], and [1763?]; *The Robin*, 1749; *The Charmer*, Vol. I, 1751; *The Sports of the Muses*, Vol. I, 1752; *The Muses Delight*, 1754; *The Polite Songster*, 1758; *The Vocal Magazine*, 1781; and in at least eight (and almost certainly more) editions of *The Tea-Table Miscellany*, printed in London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and elsewhere, between 1733 and 1788; and even so, it would be rash to imagine the list complete. The "accounts" of many of the other songs could in like manner be extended; but the main result, beyond exhaustion of the bibliographer, would be only to emphasize the unquestioned popularity of D'Urfey, and thus still further justify Professor Day in his choice of subject which he has here so adequately treated.

NORMAN AULT

Oxford

---

*The Nineteenth Century and After*. By H. V. ROUTH, Chapter XII of *The Year's Work in English Studies*, Volume XII, 1931. Edited by FREDERICK S. BOAZ and MARY S. SERJEANTSON. London: Oxford Press, 1933. Pp. 342. \$3.00.

In "The Romantic Revival" Mr. Routh discusses 3 articles and 22 books; in "The Victorian Era," 22 books; in the rest of the chapter, 8 articles and 35 books of which 8 are from German presses, 6 from the University of Pennsylvania Press, 7 from the Oxford Press, and 8 were published in 1930—if one allows for duplication, then, this line-up implies that only 11 books of importance on English literature after 1860 were published by general American and English presses in 1931. Of the 79 books discussed, 13 were published in 1930, and 4 were reprints. "The Year's Work," consequently, is represented by 62 books and 11 articles. For the same period, *M. H. R. A.* lists more than 1300 items, and omits about a hundred, a few of which (H. A. Jones's *Shadow of Henry Irving*, J. A. Fuller-Maitland's "Some Victorian Songs," F. Masson's *Victorians All*, D. Bobbé's *Fanny Kemble*) are of some importance.

For the reviewer of the Year's Work, obviously selection is necessary. And even if he does not content himself merely with such books as are sent to him, no selection can satisfy even the maker, especially in this century where amateurs, journalists and memorialists, still play in the field. For this reason, the reviewer needs to have anticipated open questions concerning his selections

and judgments to avoid the appearance of hit-or-miss-ness, of becoming a trade journalist for the university presses, or of wasting time simply by making explanations and transitions.

(1) Since selection is necessary and human strength limited, can a method be defined for representing the year's work? In every period, there are of course centers of activity, clustering about particular men or movements. In this period, for example, *M. H. R. A.* lists 28 items for Byron, more than for any other individual. Mr. Routh mentions none. And the score is 26 to 2 for the Coleridges, 24 to 0 for Poe, 22 to 4 for Dickens, 21 to 1 for Wordsworth, 19 to 2 for the Brownings, 17 to 1 for Jane Austen, 16 to 4 (including Lockhart) for Scott, 15 to 1 for the Carlyles, and so down the list to 12 to 1 for Shelley who is represented by Ullman's *Mad Shelley* (1930) rather than by Stovall's *Desire and Restraint* (1931). Meanwhile, according to Mr. Routh's representation, Annie Besant, Edmund Gosse, Julian Huxley, or Hartley Coleridge looms as large (or larger) in English letters as Coleridge, Poe, Wordsworth, Jane Austen, the Carlyles, Keats, Meredith, Tennyson, Arnold, or Shelley, a representation fair to 1931 in neither quantity nor quality. In addition, in particular years, owing to centennials or other circumstances, there are unusual points of activity. In 1931 the neo-humanist controversies wore themselves out with prolixity, for example, but though they were influential Mr. Routh mentions only one book on humanism, and that for a special reason. Finally, outstanding works like Sadleir's *Bulwer*, of which one can hardly help taking notice, give unusual flavor to a year's work. With judicious omissions and adjustments of space, a survey of these centers and points of activity might constitute a fair outline of the year's work and make reviewing it purposeful.

(2) Since selection is necessary, should not discussion be limited, perhaps only to works about English authors? Two books on Americans (Hawthorne and Emerson) are discussed, but with many another DeMille's *Literary Criticism in America*, perhaps a bit journalistic, is passed over. Mr. Routh tries to suggest correlations between studies in English and in metaphysics, religion, or sociology, reviews Hyde's *Prospects of Humanism* and Huxley's *What dare I think?*, commends a study in comparative literature, but mentions no English studies of French or German writers. Binyon's selections from Blake are discussed, but for the most part selections and editions go unnoticed. Watson's *Contemporary Comments* is considered illuminating for the romantic era; if so, why not Burton-Sitwell's *Victoriana* for the next? If Shaw's *Pen Portraits* or Chesterton's "George Bernard Shaw" is considerable, certainly then so are the Shaw-Terry letters, an outstanding book of the year. The usual reader of the *Year's Work*, I think, is apt to be sufficiently aware of proximities and varieties in annual English studies to want emphasis put on other characteristics and for



the sake of purposeful criticism to wish the scope of the *Work* clearly and systematically limited. Two years after 1931 we might do more than chat about it.

(3) To what audience, then, is the *Year's Work*, Chapter XII, directed? Is it supposed to appeal to the English specialist in his own field, in other fields in English than his own to provide outlines, or to lure neophyte readers to a love of English studies? On the answer to this open question depends in part the validity of general conclusion; that, for example, as personalities, rather than as scholars or stylists, romantic prose writers interested 1931 students. Mr. Routh looks for "style" in English studies, though it seems to me one should take for granted a decent mediocrity of style in students, whose primary concern comes necessarily to be with other matters. He inclines toward "humanism" (pp. 269, 270, 272, 279, 291, 299), a word he associates with humor, old-fashioned atmosphere, the personal, and even the picturesque and gossipy. He recommends "scholarship in parenthesis," studies which contribute perspectives rather than new facts, interpretations, or documents, studies of "more than academic interest." He even admires Bailey's *Introductions to Jane Austen* because it shows Bailey "at his best!" Yet chiefly because the method is "personal rather than critical," Ellis's *Collins, Lefanu, and Others* cannot be discussed. "Academic" seems to mean unoriginal (p. 266) or cluttered with immediately useless materials (p. 282) and dull.

One does not feel that Mr. Routh, though he writes pleasantly, has really defined for himself what he is trying to do or how to do it. As a matter of fact, some of the most "studied" work on 19th-century literature is being done in journal articles, of which Mr. Routh mentions only 11 and of which the only two from "learned journals" are from *MLN*.

ARTHUR E. DuBOIS

*Duquesne University*

---

*Legends of Angria.* Compiled from the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. By FANNIE E. RATCHFORD and WILLIAM CLYDE DE VANE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933. Pp. xviii + 332. \$3.50.

This is the most considerable collection of Brontë *juvenilia* which has yet been published. It contains four "long-short" stories and one narrative poem written by Charlotte Brontë between the ages of seventeen and twenty-three, and offers for the first time a representative selection of her contributions to that extraordinary cycle of *Angrian* literature which formed the background—or, as Miss Ratchford suggests, the main preoccupation—of her life from early childhood until shortly before she left for Brussels at

the age of twenty-six to fit herself for the profession of a school-mistress.

The origin and general character of the *Angrian* story are well known. Mrs. Gaskell quoted Charlotte's account of how the game of "making out" began in a present of toy soldiers to Branwell, and one or two separate pieces from Charlotte's pen have been published by Brontë editors. But the quantity of these early writings and the incredible elaboration of the themes as now exhibited in *Legends of Angria* come as something of a shock. The extent of the output may be gauged from Miss Ratchford's statement that the extant manuscripts from the period between Charlotte's fourteenth and twenty-fourth years aggregate more pages than her printed works, and that the year 1833, during which at the age of seventeen she wrote the earliest of the stories included in the present selection, was the most productive year of her life. Out of this mass of material, contained in the celebrated microscopic manuscripts scattered throughout the libraries of Europe and America, Miss Ratchford with Professor De Vane's help has made an intelligent and illuminating selection. Supplemented by an admirable descriptive commentary to fill in the gaps of the *Angrian* history, it presents a panorama of the complete world of the imagination which Charlotte and Branwell constructed and continually elaborated between them, and which, as Miss Ratchford is able to show by quotations from Charlotte's journals of the time, was for her the real world in which she lived and had her being through the dreary routine of life at Roe Head and the hardly less dreary intervals at the parsonage. This is perhaps the chief importance of *Legends of Angria*: it demonstrates completely the enormous hold which this world of the imagination had over Charlotte's mind in these early years. It gives a new point to the letter of Southey in which he warned her that "the day dreams in which she habitually indulged were likely to induce a distempered state of mind" and advised her to return to the world of real life with the words: "You will not seek in imagination for excitement, of which the vicissitudes of this life and the anxieties from which you must not hope to be exempted . . . will bring with them but too much." Southey's warning was laid to heart. The *Angrian* stories were given up, and Charlotte attempted no considerable composition between the last of the stories included in the present volume (written in the same year as Southey's letter) and the commencement of *The Professor* after her return from Brussels five years later. By the time she again took up the pen Southey's prophecy had been bitterly fulfilled. She had found in truth that she did not need to "seek in imagination for excitement," and all the passion which endless writing on the themes of her own heated imagination had not been able to quicken into life was released once and for all by suffering and the hard pressure of experience.

The quality of these early writings, to judge by the samples here

presented, is indeed exceedingly poor; one is almost inclined to say that the first merit of *Legends of Angria* is that it relieves one of the necessity of reading any more of them. Nevertheless, no Brontë lover can follow without interest the progress of Charlotte's mind from the crude gothicism of the earliest story — an amusing commentary this, with its apparatus of tournaments and unknown knights and subterranean dungeons, on Charlotte's dislike of Jane Austen, who could write *Northanger Abbey* at little more than the same age — to the full Byronesque flavour of the later stories, with their vivid foretaste of the future characterization of *Jane Eyre* and *Villette*. But even so the characters never come alive, and perhaps what emerges most sharply from reading these stories is the realization that Charlotte's greatest, and perhaps her only convincing, character was herself. But neither Charlotte nor Jane Eyre nor Lucy Snowe is to be found beneath the bizarre disguises of *Angria*. Charlotte needed life herself to breathe life into her characters, and it is remarkable that it should have been a literature of escape which absorbed her apprenticeship, while her real work did not begin until she was forced to allow herself a measure of autobiography.

By making it possible to set these early writings so clearly in perspective from the standpoint of Charlotte's later work, Miss Ratchford has made a real contribution to the understanding of Charlotte's genius, and her work deserves the gratitude of all Brontë students. It is much to be hoped that she will complete what she has begun by publishing an edition of the Journals, her quotations from which are perhaps the most exciting of all the discoveries which await the reader of the present volume.

P. D. PROCTOR

London

*Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten.*

Unter Mitwirkung von Wilhelm Göcking ausgewählt von  
THEODOR ABELE und M. JOSEFA BÖHNERT. Paderborn:  
Ferdinand Schöningh (o. J). 584 pp. Mk. 5.

*German Romantic Lyrics.* Selected and edited by WALTER SILZ.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. xx + 319 pp.  
\$1.75.

*Romantische Lyrik. Nach Motiven ausgewählt und geordnet* von  
Dr. MARTIN SOMMERFELD. (= Literarhistorische Bibliothek  
Bd. 4.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1933. 185 pp.  
Mk. 4.80.

*Lyrische Weltichtung in deutschen Übertragungen aus 7 Jahr-*

*hundertten.* Ausgewählt von JULIUS PETERSEN und ERICH TRUNZ. (= Literarhistorische Bibliothek Bd. 9.) Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1933. 192 pp. Mk. 4.80.

*Der Kranz*, auf Dünndruckpapier in Antiqua gedruckt und in schmiegsames Leinen sehr hübsch gebunden, kann nicht vom Standpunkte einer allgemeinen Anthologie beurteilt werden. Seine Stärke, die nach der beschaulich-religiösen Seite liegt, ist zugleich seine Beschränkung. Wo Heine mit 2, Hebbel mit 3, Storm mit 6, Keller mit 5, Meyer mit 8 Gedichten, Haller überhaupt nicht, Hagedorn mit einem, Brockes mit einem Gedichte vertreten sind, können wir von vornherein damit rechnen, daß die Romantik voll ausgemünzt und der Barock ausgiebig behandelt ist. Schiller mit 84 Seiten steht gegen Goethe mit nur 60. Hier dürfte selbst bei Anerkennung des Standpunktes die Auswahl am angreifbarsten sein, denn *Der Gang nach dem Eisenhammer*, *Die Bürgschaft*, *Der Kampf mit dem Drachen* stehen zu weit hinter dem ausgelassenen *Ganymed* oder *Vermächtnis* im Werte zurück. Im Barock fehlen natürlich Stieler, Schirmer, aber auch jede Probe von Flemings Sonetten, selbst den religiösen. Raum gewonnen ist durch diese Unterdrückung für geistliche Lyrik wie Schnüffs' Marienlied, Anton Ulrichs "Es ist genug," für Jakob Balde und gewisse Volkslieder, die kaum in andern Sammlungen berücksichtigt worden sind; andererseits für jüngere Dichter derselben Richtung, deren Namen verhältnismäßig wenig bekannt sind neben Carossa, Billinger, George und Rilke. Der bürgerliche Realismus des 19. Jahrhunderts kommt am schlechtesten weg.

Von diesem festen Standpunkte aus rundet sich *Der Kranz* dann allerdings zu einem weltanschaulichen Ganzen und bietet mit manch gutem Funde eine glückliche Ergänzung zu den landläufigen Anthologien.

Mit kurzer aber anregender Einleitung und ausgiebigen, sachkundigen Anmerkungen bietet in ansprechendem Gewande Walter Silz seine Auswahl von German Romantic Lyrics. Die Verteilung ist mit guter Perspektive getroffen, Heine mit 40, Eichendorff mit 39, Uhland mit 35 Gedichten stehen an der Spitze. Bei Mörike dürfte die Zahl zu knapp (26), bei Lenau zu reichlich bemessen sein (32). Auch ist Brentano (10) gegen Rückert (17) vielleicht zu kurz gekommen. Das völlige Fehlen Friedrich Schlegels ist bei einer Romantikersammlung zu bedauern, desgleichen der Ausschuß von Arnims "Mir ist zu licht zum Schlafen" und Luise Hensels "Müde bin ich, geh zur Ruh." Und sollte nicht auch dem so viel gesungenen Zuccalmaglio ("Es fiel ein Reif," "Schwesterlein," "Feins Liebchen," "Die Blümelein schon schlafen") endlich ein Plätzchen in unsern Anthologien trotz seiner Bearbeiterrolle eingeräumt werden?

Die metrischen Bemerkungen Silz' (verwunderlich, da er auf

Heusler als seine Autorität hinweist) stützen sich auf veraltete und sehr heterogene Theorien. Opitz' Reform besteht nicht darin, daß er akzentuierte und unakzentuierte Silben für lange und kurze einsetzte (das würde voraussetzen, daß es im Deutschen im Grunde nicht immer so gewesen wäre), sondern daß er irrtümlicherweise für die deutsche Versbehandlung Alternierung verlangte und so zwar dem deutschen Verscharakter Gewalt antat, aber Ordnung in die Verwilderung brachte, die aus einer Stilmischung hervorgegangen war.

Oktameter gibt es eigentlich nicht (S. VII), über die Sechszahl geht unser Auffassungsvermögen nicht hinaus, und die Reihe zerfällt ganz von selbst in einen ungereimten und einen gereimten Tetrameter. Der Charakter des Knittelverses ist unauflöslich gebunden an Typen und Mischvers-charakter, so daß demnach das Lenausche Gedicht "Die warme Luft, der Sonnenstrahl" nur den Mittelhochdeutschen Reimpaaren zugezählt werden kann, während Uhlands *Schwäbische Kunde* echte Knittelverse bringt. Der Knittelvers erlaubt indessen auch nicht "any number of unstressed syllables"; in ganz seltenen Fällen (Kapuzinerpredigt, die man aber am ehesten mit dem althochdeutschen Stabreimverse vergleichen kann) wird die Dreizahl erreicht.

Sommerfelds *Romantische Lyrik* sichtet und gruppiert das Material nach den bekannten Grundsätzen, wie sie sich im *Höfischen Lesebuch*, in der *Deutschen Lyrik von 1880-1930*, und der jetzt in zweiter vermehrter Auflage erschienen *Deutschen Barocklyrik* für Seminarübungen hinreichend bewährt haben. Der Gesichtspunkt der "kollektiven Leistung" tritt hier besonders hervor.

Mit strenger Wahl schließt sich der 9. Band dieser Sammlung an, der 23 fremdsprachliche Vorbilder vom 23. Psalme an bis zu Swinburnes *Song*, von den antiken Sprachen über die Romanischen (leider mit Ausschluß des Spanischen!) bis zum Englischen, in vielen und zeitlich auseinanderliegenden deutschen Uebersetzungen bringt. Besonders erfreulich ist die praktische Druckanordnung, die es erlaubt, das fremdsprachliche Original jedesmal herauszufalten und so den Vergleich mit den Übertragungen zu erleichtern. Eine ausführliche Bibliographie mit Angabe weiterer Versuche ermöglicht die Ausdehnung der Arbeit, die selbst für amerikanische Studenten eine lohnende Aufgabe wäre und nicht weniger bedeutet als einen Überblick über die Entwicklung der deutschen Übersetzungskunst durch 5 Jahrhunderte.

Es wäre außerordentlich wünschenswert, wenn die Sammlung noch ein gleiches Bändchen für das Drama brächte, zumal ein Bändchen, welches die Eroberung Shakespeares darstellte.

ERNST FEISE

*La Poésie lyrique des Troubadours.* By ALFRED JEANROY. Two volumes. Paris: Henri Didier and Toulouse: Edouard Privat, 1934. Pp. viii + 812.

This is the most comprehensive survey of the troubadour lyric to appear since that of Diez, and accordingly is the only modern attempt to coördinate and appraise on a large scale the scattered material which has been made available during the last hundred years in new editions of the poems, in critical studies and in historical discoveries concerning the poets' lives and times. Needless to say, the wide-ranging knowledge of the author, his rare sanity and sound judgment will make these two volumes indispensable to all Romance scholars.

Volume I, after a preliminary sketch of Provençal studies from the sixteenth century to the present and a short chapter on the language of the troubadours, is devoted to questions of origin, of the credence to be given the ancient biographies, and of the diffusion of the Provençal lyric in France and across the borders. A list of troubadours by regions and a bio-bibliographical list (largely superceded by the new Pillet-Carstens' *Bibliographie der Troubadours*) complete this part of the work. Volume II takes up the more important poets and discusses the various types of poetry that they wrote.

It is difficult to examine within reasonable limits so comprehensive and detailed a work, every page of which is tightly packed with the results of the fruitful erudition of the author, and in what follows only some of the more important conclusions can be suggested. J. opposes the theory that the common language of the troubadours derives from Limousin and sees in it rather a *lingua franca* understandable throughout the whole region ruled at the end of the twelfth century by the counts of Toulouse, "où un commencement de centralisation politique avait pu entraîner un commencement d'unité linguistique" (I, 52). His deductions regarding the origins of the Provençal lyric are reasonable and conservative: "l'art des troubadours, poétique et musical, est donc né . . . d'une étroite collaboration entre un public de grands seigneurs animé de goûts littéraires et une classe de professionnels doués d'un esprit assez souple et inventif pour avoir pu s'adapter à ces goûts" (I, 88). One would have welcomed a more extensive investigation here, e. g. a differentiation between matter and technique, and a discussion of the possible influence of church music, liturgical texts, mediaeval schools of rhetoric and the secular lyrics of the clerks. (Hilka and Schumann's new edition of the *Carmina Burana* and Strecker's of the *Cambridge Songs* have brought some chronological order into the chaos that is posited in I, 80; in II, 284 J. himself connects the *pastourelle* with secular Latin poems;

two articles of Scheludko are cited, but not those in *ZFSL.*, 52 [1929], 1, 201, and *Arch Rom.*, xv [1931], 137, nor those of Spanke in *ZFSL.*, 51 [1928], 73; 53 [1930], 113; 54 [1931], 282, 385; and in *ZRP.*, 51 [1931], 309.)

The ancient biographies are relegated to the ignominious place generally assigned them today, but J. agrees with Stronski in thinking they may nevertheless be relied upon to a great extent for facts about the troubadours' provenance and social condition (I, 101; cf. J.'s own article in *Arch Rom.*, I, 1917, 289, which he does not cite, and the prudent words of O. H. Moore in *PMLA.*, 29, 1914, 518). J. seemingly accepts, though he does not discuss, the derivation of *trobar* from *tropare* (I, 135). His important researches concerned with the diffusion of the Provençal lyric in Spain, Portugal, Italy and Germany must be left to specialists in the literatures of those countries to evaluate. The difficulty of stating how contacts occurred even between the north and south of France is evident from I, 266 f.; J. rejects the possibility of border contacts and minimizes the rôle of the crusades, attributing the introduction of Provençal poetry in the north to "snobisme aristocratique" and emphasizing the preponderance of noblemen among the poets.

In volume II, various troubadours are neatly characterized: Arnaut Daniel is the "coryphée du 'trobar ric'" (II, 49), Peire Vidal is "un vrai gamin de Paris, il y a déjà l'étoffe d'un Marot" (155), Bertran de Born is "un condottiere besogneux et sans scrupules, qui se trouvait être un poète de génie" (199), and these few citations will perhaps serve to indicate the literary charm and distinction of a work that is essentially learned. Moreover, J. repeatedly shows that while he is fully appreciative of the troubadours' merits, he is under no illusions about their poetical vices, their conventional imagery, stereotyped forms and formulae, lack of sincerity and the power of fresh observation. Such extravagant admirers of the troubadour lyric as Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot would do well to ponder the words of this specialist.

In the pages devoted to the various types of lyric J.'s observations about the *genres dialogués* (II, 247 f.) and the *chansons de danse* (297 f.) are of special interest: he attributes a possible northern origin to the *partimen* (260-1) and indicates the importance of the north in the development of the late Provençal *pastourelles* (291); he classifies the *chansons à toile* and the *chansons de mal mariée* with the *chansons de danse*, believes the *aube* and *pastourelle* also furnished themes for songs written to accompany dancing, and reasons from the relative scarcity of such songs among the thirteenth century Provençal lyrics either that the Midi did less dancing to song than the north or that, more probably, social life, because of political circumstances, was less intense there at this time (303). The final chapters of the work

are devoted to religious poetry and to the disappearance of the troubadour lyric, the extinction of which is plausibly equated with the overthrow of the old nobility and the rise to power of foreigners, ignorant and disdainful of both the Provençal language and literature.

No summary, especially one emphasizing controversial points only, can hope to do justice to this magnificent undertaking. Scholars may disagree with the author's inferences here and there, they may detect in these volumes various bibliographical omissions, they will doubtless regret the inconvenient arrangement of the work and the absence of any index, but they cannot fail to be grateful to him for having gathered this vast store of material together, for having made accessible the results of his own extensive researches and his judicious estimates of the contributions of others, in short, for having irradiated the whole sphere of Provençal studies with his wisdom, his sensibility and his charm.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois.* Par WALTHER VON WARTBURG. Paris: Droz, 1934. Pp. 140. (Société de publications romanes et françaises VIII.)

The publication of the monumental *Atlas linguistique de la France* by Gilliéron and Edmont has not only stimulated the compilation of many glossaries of local dialects, but it has also aroused imitation outside of France. The numerous investigations of these patois, many of which are obsolescent, are now being studied in their entirety, together with normal French, by Professor W. von Wartburg in his *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Consequently no one is better qualified to present a systematic bibliography of the Gallo-Romance dialects. The *Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois* is a reference-work which will be very useful to every student of Romance philology. [Incidentally, the present reviewer has completed a companion bibliography entitled *Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français*.]

The titles are divided into four logical groups: généralités, français, franco-provençaux, provençaux. The subdivisions are made on linguistic, historical, and geographic criteria. The map not only reproduces the numbers for the places studied in the *A. L. F.*, but indicates the other localities for which lexica are available. An alphabetical list of all the places covers pages 131-141. It is to be noted that in addition to recording printed works, Wartburg also enters the titles of many glossaries still in manuscript form. The scope of this enterprise and the facility with which the reader is enabled to consult it make it worthy of the highest praise.



On page 11 Wartburg enumerates the five bibliographies which attempted to cover the field of French dialectology. Although they lack many of the titles contained in the present bibliography, they were made too extensive by virtue of including works not of a lexicographical nature. The most serviceable of the five was the one compiled by Wartburg himself in 1929 in order to indicate the sources of his *Frz. etym. Wtb.* A sixth one worthy of mention is the collection of Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte, now in the Newberry Library of Chicago. The catalogue of it by V. Collins (London, 1894), pp. 175-232, records approximately 1000 items. The present repertory offers 1101 items, some of which will now be discussed.

Instead of the inadequate treatment given to argot in items 23-34, 646, 748, it would seem preferable to note the bibliography for French slang by A. Dauzat, *Les Argots* (Paris, 1929), pp. 171-3; neither Wartburg nor Dauzat cites E. Chautard, *La Vie étrange de l'argot* (Paris, 1931); W. Hunger, *Argot* (Leipzig, 1917); O. Leroy, *A Glossary of French Slang* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1922); L. Sainéan, *L'Argot des tranchées* (Paris, 1915). 190, L. F. Daire's *Dictionnaire* is appended to his *Histoire des Doyennés du Diocèse d'Amiens*. Items 194 and 195 should be combined. 331 is entitled *Glossaire étym. et hist. des patois et des parlers de l'Anjou*. For an analysis of 367, cf. *Speculum*, VII (1932), 439. 369 was edited by J. H. Burgaud des Marets. 381, H. A. Major and W. A. Pickens are preparing a *Glossary of Louisiana French*. 383, Rougé's *Le Parler tourangeau*, appeared in 1912 at Paris. 450 was reedited by F. Fertiault (Paris, 1842). Offprints have appeared of 493 Piétrement, *Le Patois Briard* (Paris, 1888) and 541 Piquet, *Le Patois de Dombras* (Paris, 1929). 549, the complete title is H. Labourasse, *Glossaire abrégé du patois de la Meuse, notamment de celui de Vouhons* (Arcis-sur-Aube, 1887). The fact that certain items (e. g., 646 and 677) form "fascicules" of the *Bibl. école h. études* is not indicated. In 648, p. 744 is a misprint for p. 844. The index to 769 is found in vol. II, pp. 769-778. Item 810 was issued separately as *Dictionnaire du patois de Lallé* (Gap, 1909). 1101, the author's name is Ducéré.

No mention is found of the following lexica: J. Hennig, *Die frz. Sprache im Munde der Belgier und die Marollenmundart* Brüssels (Heidelberg, 1926); T. Hersart de la Villemarqué, *Dict. breton-fran. de Le Gonidec* (St. Brieuc, 1850); A. E. Troude, *Nouveau dict. pratique breton-fran.* (Brest, 1876); A. H. Schutz, "The Peasant Voc. in the Works of George Sand," *Univ. Missouri Studies*, II, No. 1 (1927); T. Mignard, *Hist. de l'idiotisme bourguignon* (Dijon, 1856); M. Barthès, *Glossaire botanique languedocien-fran.-latin de l'arr. de St.-Pons* (Montpellier, 1873).

In the "Liste des Auteurs" a few names need to be revised as follows: Bruneau 509, Collard 140, Duméril, Haust pp. 11 and 17, Jaubert 396, Rohlfis 906, Simonet, Violet 442-3. The "Liste des Vocabulaires Spéciaux" is limited to generic terms, and should be lengthened to include individual authors (e. g. 450) and word-studies (e. g. 9). Since it refers to Judaeo-Provençal (837, 842), it might not be amiss to note the bibliography of 70 sources for mediaeval Judaeo-French in *Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive* (Baltimore, 1932), pp. 10-12.

These comments merely reflect the importance of Wartburg's *Bibliographie* and do not detract at all from its great utility and splendid presentation.

RAPHAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

*From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman.* By M. K. POPE. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1934. Pp. xxix + 571. (French Series VI.)

The latest work by Professor M. K. Pope of the University of Manchester reflects perspicacious application and boundless patience in a field which certainly is not unploughed, but where keen discernment is needed to separate the rank weeds from the lush growth. A brief review can not do justice to Professor Pope's detailed investigation of the evolution of phonology and morphology from Latin to the refined French of the seventeenth century, together with an outline of the history of orthography. This valuable contribution to the study of the French language deserves high recommendation as a reference-work for teachers and as collateral reading for graduate students.

Professor Pope has drawn freely upon her predecessors, in particular upon Brunot, Meyer-Lübke, Nyrop, and Tanqueray, but her method of compilation and of presentation is original. The principal divisions of this compendium are: I External History of the Language (§ 1-92), which seems to be less profound than other treatises on the same subject; II Phonology (§ 93-687), covering all changes of vowels and consonants and concluding with a comprehensive Table of Sounds; III Orthography (§ 688-746), traced from the ninth through the seventeenth century; IV Morphology (§ 747-1067), including an extensive Table of Verbs; V Anglo-Norman (§ 1068-1319), which emphasizes the influence of the indigenous tongue upon the development of French in England and which offers a succinct survey of sounds, declensions, and conjugations; VI An Appendix (§ 1320-1329), which summarizes conveniently the dialectal traits of northern and western France to which reference has been made *passim*.

The main processes underlying the phonetic and morphological evolution stand out in relief, while controversial questions and dialectal variants are given a subordinate position by the use of small type. If time is at a premium, the student can follow easily the general course of this development by itself and omit the details. A most praiseworthy innovation is the constant documentation for the changes in sound and flexion by quotations from mediaeval texts and from contemporary grammarians. A mere list of linguistic phenomena without concrete examples would correspond to a skeleton as closely as a dictionary limited to words and their meanings.

A decided preference for the analytical to the synthetic is quite proper in the body of this manual. On the other hand, the bibliographies fused with the abbreviations have too many subdivisions. The lists of titles might be combined alphabetically, retaining the chronological indications. All the scattered abbreviations could be

assembled in one general group at the beginning. Likewise the Index of Verbs is unnecessarily separated from the Word-Index.

It might not be amiss to revise some of the titles. Page xxi, *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ed. W. Suchier (1932); Bernard: combine Schulze ed. of Berlin MS. with Foerster ed. of Paris MS. [p. xxiii; the Nantes MS. is described by L. Delisle, *Journal des savants* (mars 1900), pp. 148-164]. xxii, E. S. Tyler, ed. *La Chançon de Willame* (New York, 1919); A. Bayot, ed. *Poème Moral* (Bruxelles, 1929). xxvi, J. Streicher, *Vaugelas*: fac-similé de l'éd. originale avec index (Paris, 1934). xxvii, Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Gram. frz. Spr.* (1913). xxviii, Schwan & Behrens, *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen* (Leipzig, 1925); F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française . . .* 10, Müller, *Zts. rom. Ph.*, Beiheft 78 (1929). 21, M. A. Pei, *The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in N. France* (New York, 1932). 48, *Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive* (Baltimore, 1932). 483, *Gaimar*, ed. A. Bell (Manchester, 1925). 486, W. von Wartburg, *Bibl. dict. patois* (Paris, 1934).

RAPHAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

---

*Three French Dramatists, Racine, Marivaux, Musset.* By ARTHUR TILLEY, Cambridge: University Press. Pp. ix + 206.

Gladstone saw nothing in Molière's masterpieces but third-class plays and the great Liberal leader's countrymen have always displayed a remarkable indifference to many of Molière's contemporaries, especially to Racine. Professor Tilley has desired to increase the admiration for Racine and his two spiritual descendants, Marivaux and Musset, and in his *Three French Dramatists* has given us one of the best introductions to the dramatists concerned that we have in English. He groups the three together, since each shows a profound interest in psychology, a strong dramatic sense, and a highly individualistic style. Because the appreciation of their plays comes only with careful perusal and minute study, T. confines himself almost exclusively to a detailed analysis of each of the plays, excluding all else save a few biographical details. His great familiarity with all of the works of the three writers, his keen insight, and his enthusiasm should arouse the interest of indifferent Anglo-Saxons to the merits of these dramatists, so typically French and so highly valued in their own country. If he does not attain his goal, one must lay the fault to the idiosyncracies of national and racial tastes in matters of all forms of art and more especially literature. One finds it difficult, however, to determine the class of reader whom T. had in mind, as he wrote the book. To one unfamiliar with the subject, the many analyses of plots, in spite of much skill and penetration, will not prove sufficiently interesting to hold the attention, while the close student of French literature will find all the material in more extended form in three

critics, Lemaître for Racine, Larroumet for Marivaux, and Lafoscade for Musset, to all of whom T. acknowledges his indebtedness.

His enthusiasm sometimes leads him astray. He feels, for example, that modern novelists, however proficient in Freudian psychology, 'might profit from a study of these careful explorers of the human heart' but he does not realize that the Freudian novelist approaches his subject from an entirely different point of view, which makes comparison impossible. T. feels that the Englishman must be conscious of the merits of Racine. In discussing *Esther* he writes: "Even a foreigner can appreciate the beauty of the style and the music of the verse . . . the verse flows on like a limpid stream, making music as it flows." The music of the verse of *Esther* occasions a repetition of this remark: "Its high quality is recognized by all Frenchmen and even a foreigner can appreciate it." One could cite much to disprove these statements concerning the ability of the foreigner, especially the Anglo-Saxon, to appreciate this aspect of Racine's poetry. As Paul Valéry says: "Racine leur (les étrangers) est interdit. Ses harmonies sont trop subtiles." F. Y. Eccles in his Taylorian Lecture, *Racine in England*, finds Racine too essentially French for England: Racine is "a poet of his own soil, the flower of a certain civilization: nor do those who love him best in France seek to impose their admiration on the world at large. They know how little of him is fit for export." Jules Lemaître held a similar opinion and C. J. Baily wrote *The Claims of French Poetry* to win the appreciation of the non-dramatic French verse on the part of the English reader who has acquired an aversion to all French poetry because of a dislike of French dramatic verse. Englishmen have sometimes grown enthusiastic over a performance of a play of Racine, especially *Phèdre*, but, in such instances, it is probably the actress in the leading rôle rather than Racine who causes the enthusiasm. The poet Gray and Horace Walpole both praised very highly Mlle Dumesnil in the role of *Phèdre* and Mlle Clairon, in the same role, caused Charlotte Brontë to "shudder to the marrow of her bones." It would have been very interesting, had T. given us a few such statements of English writers as to their opinions on Racine.

Marivaux presents perhaps more difficulties than Racine for the Englishman who finds 'marivaudage' to be rather much ado about nothing in particular. Even in France the number of Marivaux's admirers is restricted. T. even suspects that d'Alembert, when he speaks of the comedies written in 'ce singulier jargon,' had never read or seen any of them performed. Frenchmen still remember La Harpe's famous remark on Marivaux's plays: "On sourit mais on bâille." Admitting with T. that *Le Jeu de l'Amour et du Hasard* is a play of many merits, English taste will still prefer to the delicately drawn characters of Marivaux the robust men and women of *She Stoops to Conquer*, compared with whom Silvia and Dorante seem like faded pastels.

Musset, with his reminiscences of Shakespeare, should have made a greater appeal to England. His plays, as T. states, are "within their limits, masterpieces" but England probably knows Musset, not as a dramatist, but as the lover of George Sand. His comedies, so light, fantastic, and poetic, remain, notwithstanding T's analysis, like the plays of Racine and Marivaux, too delicate and fragile for export.

In spite of this very worthy effort on the part of Professor Tilley to overcome a national prejudice, English-speaking peoples will undoubtedly continue to ignore the existence of these three so typically French dramatists. Taine, as he takes leave of his reader in *l'Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, accepts complacently the limitations of his literary taste. Sentiment rather than reason forms the basis of his own preference of Musset over Tennyson and also of the Englishman's indifference to Racine, Marivaux, and Musset.

JAMES F. MASON

Cornell University

*Collin d'Harleville Dramatist.* By LAURENCE HERVEY SKINNER.

New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies,  
1933. 202 pp.

Dr. Skinner's dissertation conveys, at times, a reasonable estimate of Collin's works. It betrays, however, the earmarks of haste, for one finds in it lengthy analyses (*Inconstant*, 8 pp.; *Vieux célibataire*, 10), excessive quotations (12-14, 26-27, 160-162), superfluous comments (116, 118, 120, 122), repetitions and digressions (166, 186, 187), suggesting a monograph blown into a book—an inflation the more apparent since it is not readily seen what S. contributes to the knowledge of the subject. Language, organization (conclusion re-opens discussion), handling of references (catalogue-wise), inaccuracies, lack of perspective are testimonies of insufficient preparation.

S. has it (69-70) that M. Lanson rated Collin a follower of Molière. Indeed, after stating that Molière did not satisfy Boileau, M. Lanson adds that Boileau's precept regarding expression "mène à la comédie spirituelle . . . : Destouches . . . Collin." M. Lanson goes on to say (*op. cit.*, 505-506): "[Boileau] trouve [Molière] . . . trop grossièrement vivant. Voilà la grande erreur . . . de Boileau." M. Lanson is not exactly handing the palm to Collin. S. would have done well to ignore completely M. Lanson, whose judgment, "la comédie classique en vers ira s'évanouir dans les pâles œuvres des Collin d'Harleville . . ." (*id.*, 816) does not encourage the notion of a Collin reviving Molière (173).

From the fact that Collin's "Return to nature" "means return to a simple . . . life" the conclusion is drawn that Collin's



depicted in the Press of the Period.<sup>2</sup> More stress has likewise been laid on the importance of the chronological order of articles dealing with this question. Particularly helpful in this respect is the recent work of M. René Bray: *Chronologie du romantisme* (1804-1830).<sup>3</sup> The authors of the series of which this present work is volume I, proceeding along this same line, propose to bring together in available form the most significant pamphlets, manifestos, and Press articles dealing with Romanticism, especially those which are not of easy access. The magnitude of the proposed task is evident from the fact that volume I covers only the first four years of the period selected (1813-1830).

MM. Eggli and Martino have shown good judgment in beginning with 1813, the year in which three important polemic works make their appearance in rapid succession in France: (1) Sismondi's *De la littérature du Midi de l'Europe* (I-II, May 7, 1813; III-IV, June 4), Schlegel's *Cours de littérature dramatique* (Dec. 10, 1813), Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* (Nicolle, Paris, May 21, 1814). We know, of course, that the term "romantisme" in its full technical sense does not come into free usage until after Augier's *Discours sur le romantisme*, April 24, 1824, and that Victor Hugo that same year makes the frequently quoted statement in the *Préface* to his *Odes et Ballades* that he "ignore profondément ce que c'est que le genre classique et que le genre romantique." However, we know that the controversy had been waging for ten years previous to that date with the opponents lined up and employing definite terms such as "poésie romantique, théâtre romantique," etc., and even the categorical expressions "école classique" and "école romantique."<sup>4</sup> The choice of the date 1830 to close the series is the natural one since after the Revolution of July, the public is more interested in other questions, and the discussion in regard to the new School becomes less intense.

The ordinary method of procedure adopted by M. Eggli in his presentation of the material is as follows: (1) a commentary on the status of the question at the time of the appearance in France of the book or article under discussion, (2) the work itself reprinted *in extenso* or analyzed, (3) Press criticism. In a concise Introduction he emphasizes the confusion of ideas existing in France in regard to Romanticism in the early years of the nineteenth century. In Germany by 1813 there existed a definite Romantic doctrine,

<sup>2</sup> Other noteworthy publications in the same field are the following: J. Marsan, *La Muse française*, 1907-9; H. F. Stewart and A. Tilley, *The Romantic Movement in French Literature*, 1910; P. van Tieghem, *Le mouvement romantique*, 1912; Helen M. King, *Les doctrines littéraires de la Quotidienne*, 1920; P. Trahard, *Le romantisme défini par le Globe*, 1924; J. Marsan, *Le Conservateur littéraire*, 1926.

<sup>3</sup> Paris, 1932.

<sup>4</sup> Employed in the prospectus of the *Journal général de France*, which first appeared Sept. 1, 1814.

while in France it was not until about 1820 that definite attempts were made to formulate a doctrine. Previous to that date scholars were content to accept the position of Sébastien Mercier, who declared in 1801 in his *Néologie* "On sent le romantique, on ne le définit pas." Such was the condition of affairs when in 1813 the appearance of the three works mentioned before gave the impression in France of a concerted attack against the hegemony of the French classic literature in Europe. In keeping with this idea the author has adopted as the general title for volume 1 of the series "L'Offensive du romantisme allemand et la réaction française."<sup>5</sup>

The work of Sismondi, which appeared in France six months before that of Schlegel, was received at first, on account of its liberal tone and lack of aggressiveness, without great bitterness. When the *Cours de littérature dramatique* appeared, however, making it evident that Sismondi had obtained many of his ideas from the German production, the tone changed. The movement was conceived as "délibérément antifrançais." One critic, Dussault, even suggested that the two writers were in collusion in an attack on French literature (*Journal de l'Empire*, March 11, 1814). National feeling was intensified by the fact that the allied armies were in France at this time. When the *Dé l'Allemagne* appeared, it was impossible not to associate it with the preceding two works, and with but rare exceptions it received similar hostile treatment. One exception was the laudatory pamphlet *Les scrupules littéraires de Mme la baronne de Staël*, by Alexandre Soumet (Oct. 22, 1814). This is one of the three productions which M. Egli has published in full (pp. 217-240). Two months later, there appeared in *Le Spectateur* (Dec. 1814) an article by Antoine Jay, probably inspired by Soumet's pamphlet, praising French classic literature and attacking Shakespeare and the Romanticists. This article entitled *Discours sur le genre romantique* is also reprinted in this present volume (pp. 243-256).

In the year 1815, the critics cease to emphasize so strongly the idea of the foreign literary invasion and the question is debated more on its literary merits. In 1816, the discussion becomes more general in scope and more French in character. The work most influential perhaps in keeping the debate alive in the year 1816 was the celebrated *Anti-Romantique* of Saint-Chamans (Dec. 23, 1815), the last of the three important works reproduced *in extenso* by Professor Egli (pp. 317-447).

The latter part of the volume is devoted to discussion in the Press of Romanticism in general, to articles dealing with the *Adolphe* of Benjamin Constant (June 22, 1816), the *Voyage en Angleterre* of L. Simond (April 27, 1816), and the translation by J. G. Hess of Schiller's *Maria Stuart* (July 20, 1816). In several

<sup>5</sup> Professor Egli has previously treated some phases of this subject in his work on *Schiller et le romantisme français*, 1927.



of the newspaper articles we find a discussion of Shakespeare and occasional references to other English writers. While a full treatment of English influence belongs in the later volumes of the series dealing with the period when the works of Scott and Byron have their vogue in France, a short chapter on that phase of the question would have been welcome in this book.

M. Eggli has made a valuable contribution to the literature on Romanticism. He has made an excellent choice of subjects from a chaotic mass of material and has presented them with scholarly accuracy. The entire work is well documented. Scholars in this field will look forward to the completion of the series.

*University of Illinois*

D. H. CARNAHAN

## BRIEF MENTION

*Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries.* Edited by M. M. KNAPPEN. Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1933. Pp. xiii + 148. \$3.00. The diaries here edited from little-known manuscripts were kept by Richard Rogers, Puritan lecturer of Essex (1551-1618), from 1587 to 1590 and Samuel Ward, master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (1572-1643), from 1595 to 1599 (with a few jottings down to 1640). They are altogether dismal reading. In each the great events of Elizabethan literature and history are ignored, so that students interested in those subjects will find almost nothing of value. But the book is described as the second volume of *Studies in Church History*, and no doubt it will interest students of religion, for whom it was primarily intended. Mr. Knappen's editorial work deserves praise. The mere deciphering of the diaries was, to judge from his facsimiles, a laborious task; and he has contributed full and well-documented lives of Rogers and Ward, amplifying and correcting the sketches in the *DNB.*, as well as a valuable essay on "The Puritan Character as Seen in the Diaries" that is far more entertaining than the manuscripts on which it is based.

HYDER E. ROLLINS

*Harvard University*

*Elizabethan Book-Pirates.* By CYRIL BATHURST JUDGE. Harvard Studies in English, VIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1934. Pp. xiv + 198. \$2.50. This volume is a distinguished addition to a distinguished series. Dr. Judge's discussion of various lawsuits which agitated the Stationers' Company during the reign of Elizabeth throws

valuable new light upon the ethics and general conduct of the London book trade in its earliest organized period. The cases treated illustrate the operation of the objectionable monopolistic system which clogged the progress of the printers' art in England and came near justifying the piracies that it encouraged. The last case, that of Simon Stafford in 1597-1598, shows the Stationers' Company emerging from its place of juniority among the London guilds and establishing its paramount right to handle the distribution of books, as against the traditional claims of the members of older companies (such as, in Stafford's case, the Drapers). Dr. Judge's book is a valuable supplement to the new *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576 to 1602*, printed by Dr. Greg and Miss Boswell in 1930 and to Mr. H. R. Hoppe's monograph on John Wolfe in *The Library*, December, 1933. It gives us—not indeed the formal history of the Elizabethan Stationers' Company, which is still a desideratum—but certainly the most lucid and readable account yet available of the way in which the Company met some of its chief crises. The documents, printed here for the first time, are of real interest and appear to be very faithfully transcribed.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

---

*Der Prosastil in den Märchen Clemens Brentanos.* Von Dr. ILSE MAHL. (= Germanische Studien Heft 110.) Berlin: Ebering, 1931. 131 pp. Mk. 5. Der Inhalt dieser Studie geht über den zu eng gewählten Titel hinaus, denn sie bespricht Themen und Phantasiegehalt der Märchen, Komposition und weltanschaulichen Gehalt, bevor sie den Stil des sprachlich-künstlerischen Ausdrucks untersucht und auf Grund dieser Analyse das Verhältnis der Märchen untereinander sowie ihre Stellung in der Märchenliteratur feststellt. Die Arbeit bewegt sich auf sicherem Tatsachengrunde ohne Spitzfindigkeiten, allerdings auch hier und da ohne philosophische und psychologische Vertiefung und Fingerspitzengefühl. Stärker hätte sicher das Verhältnis Brentanos zu seinem Kinderpublikum berücksichtigt werden können in Anbetracht seines Improvisationstalentes. Sobald ein Märchenenergähler über die traditionelle Art des Volksmärchens hinausgeht, wird er zur Veranschaulichung, realistischer Einbeziehung von Zügen des täglichen Lebens gedrängt, eine Realistik, die nicht ursprünglich literarischer Art ist, sondern an die Sinnlichkeit des Kindes appelliert. Sobald der traditionelle Weg verlassen ist, ist der sprühenden Phantasie Brentanos Tür und Tor geöffnet.

Wertvoll und einleuchtend ist die chronologische Ordnung der Märchen auf Grund der durch die Analyse gewonnenen Einsichten im fünften Kapitel der Studie, die den Weg Brentanos vom Volks-

mäßigen zu immer größerer Komplizierung, zu Manier und endlich zu christlich-ethischer Didaktik nachzeichnet.

ERNST FEISE

*The Wits; or, Sport upon Sport.* Edited by JOHN JAMES ELSON. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1932. Pp. xiv + 440. \$4.50. Dr. Elson is to be congratulated on a handsome and scholarly edition of this celebrated Restoration miscellany. Everyone has heard of the "drolls," but few have read them. The editor presents them in carefully collated texts, with ample citation of their verbal departures from the parent plays and with notes bibliographical and critical.

H. S.

*The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare.* By EDWIN ELIOT WILLOUGHBY. (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, No. 8.) At the Oxford University Press, for the Bibliographical Society, 1932. Pp. xvi + 70. This admirable monograph is "a first step" toward the performance of a task which has its importance for the textual critic: the different passages of [the First Folio] should be assigned to the journeymen who composed them, and a careful study should then be made of the typographical habit of each compositor [in order to] render the textual criticism of over half of the plays of Shakespeare more impersonal and certain than it is at present.

Dr. Willoughby's contribution consists of an examination of typographical practices in the Jaggards' shop, a modification of Mr. Satchell's suggestions (*TLS.*, June 3, 1920) for distinguishing the compositors, a consideration of the proof-reading based on the Folger Library's corrected page (352) of *Anthony and Cleopatra* and the original settings of the last page of *Romeo and Juliet* and the first of *Troilus and Cressida* in the Toovey-Morgan copy, the establishing of a time-table for the printing, a reconstruction of the order in which the plays were handled, and the conclusion that difficulties with various owners of portions of the copy (rather than carelessness on the part of the printer) caused certain irregularities such as the placing of *Troilus and Cressida* at the head of the tragedies. Dr. Willoughby's grand conclusion is reassuringly optimistic: we need not suppose "that the compositors and proof-readers of the First Folio introduced any great corruption into the text." The value of this brochure is enhanced by facsimiles of the three pages mentioned, and by a reproduction of the slightly broken tailpiece on which the author builds an ingenious argument for the suspension of work on the Folio during an interval of about fourteen months. It is to be hoped that, having made the "first step" with such success, Dr. Willoughby will undertake the heroic task of trying to reach the goal he describes in the quotation at the head of this notice.

H. S.

*Die französischen Ödipusdramen. Ein Beitrag zum Fortleben der Antike und zur Geschichte der französischen Tragödie.* Von WOLFGANG JÖRDENS. Bochum-Langendreer, 1933. Pp. viii + 149. This is an antebellum type of German dissertation with long analyses and discussions of structure, and with numerous quotations from critics. The fortunes of *Œdipus tyrannus* are traced from Corneille to Cocteau; those of *Œdipus at Colonus* from Garnier to Gide. The work is done with pains and conscience. At times, however, the batteries shell the wrong objective, for the reader is willing to believe that *Œdipus tyrannus* is a great play, without the O. K. of Jebb and Wilamowitz (p. 1), while he remains skeptical of the statement that Corneille knew Sophocles only in translation when it is supported by a mere reference (p. 23) to his "Théâtre choisi, Paris, 1930." I may add that it is misleading to say (p. 29) that only in *Œdipe* and in *Médée* did Corneille draw tragic material from Greek mythology, as he also wrote *Andromède* and the *Toison d'or*, both of which he called tragedies; and that, if Herr Jördens had read d'Aubignac's diatribe against *Œdipe*, he would have realized that Corneille did not sacrifice so much to the tastes of his contemporaries as most of the scholars he cites seem to think. In the Abbé's outraged opinion Corneille modernized *Œdipus* so little that he allowed him, prince though he was, to cross Greece alone, without a valet to give him his slippers and his "bonnet de nuit"!

H. C. L.

---

*University of Texas Studies in English* (Number 13). Austin, 1933. Pp. 138. \$1.00. This book contains "Witchcraft in the Novels of Sir Walter Scott" by M. Boatright; "An Unsigned Poem by Mirabeau Lamar" by P. Graham; "Boyse's 'Albion's Triumph'" by R. H. Griffith; "Spenser and the Earlier Pastoral Elegy" and "Spenser and Shelley's 'Adonais'" by T. P. Harrison, Jr.; "Two Shakespearian Pictures of Puritans" by R. A. Law; "Two Sources of Poe's 'Arthur Gordon Pym'" by D. M. McKeithan; "Sir Thomas Elyot and the 'Sayings of the Philosophers'" by D. T. Starnes; and "More about Queen Elizabeth's Euphuism" by T. Stenberg.

---

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

MARCH, 1935

Number 3

---

## SPENSER'S URANIA

In *The Teares of the Muses*, the speech of each Muse embodies Spenser's conception of her particular function. The speech of Urania (lines 481-540) presents an interesting problem, for in it her classical character as Muse of Astronomy is overlaid with alien, non-classical elements. Urania begins, like several of her sisters, by bemoaning man's present "love of blindness and of ignorance" because of which he wanders "in error and in doubt, open to the dangers of "fleshes frailtie and deceit of sin." Only "the heavenlie light of knowledge" can raise him out of the mire and give him guidance and strength and grace. Then she proceeds to tell the nature of the knowledge which she can give. Through her gift man may learn of the world's creation, how Nature formed things out of a formless mass. He may also come to know himself and his duties to man and to God. From the sphere of mundane things he may "mount aloft unto the skie" and behold the hierarchy of the heavens, the stars and the movement of the spheres, and

The Spirites and Intelligences fayre,  
And Angels waighting on th'Almighties chayre.

And there, with humble minde and high insight,  
Th'eternall Makers majestie wee viewe,  
His love, his truth, his glorie, and his might,  
And mercie more than mortall men can vew.  
O soveraigne Lord, O soveraigne happinesse,  
To see thee, and thy mercie measurelesse!

Such happiness have they that doo embrace  
The precepts of my heavenlie discipline;  
But shame and sorrow and accursed case  
Have they that scorne the schoole of arts divine,  
And banish me, which do professe the skill  
To make men heavenly wise through humbled will.

Urania, then, is the patroness of a good deal more than Astronomy. Four lines are devoted to her classical character; the next fourteen make her appear as the Muse of Christian theology, the power through which we achieve the Beatific Vision and become morally and religiously regenerated.

Commenting on the speech as a whole, Professor Renwick says, "Here Spenser summarizes rapidly the content of philosophical studies, forgetting for a moment the Muse of Astronomy in his pleased recollection of the Bible, Cicero, Christian theology, natural philosophy, and ethics."<sup>1</sup> The question is: is Spenser forgetting the Muse or is he keeping her well in mind? Is there justification in the traditional interpretations of Urania for his making her speak as she does?

There was in classical times no fixed division of the functions of the Muses nor any regular correspondence between their names and their natures.<sup>2</sup> Hesiod<sup>3</sup> speaks of them as a group and only names Urania as one of the nine. Ausonius was apparently the first to set down in neat mnemonic arrangement the functions of each of the nine, in lines which were attributed to Vergil in most sixteenth-century editions of his works and which Spenser certainly knew. In these lines, Urania "poli motus scrutatur et astra." Plutarch is voicing the classical conception when he says, "We suppose that there is but one of the Muses who presides in heaven and over heavenly things, and she is Urania."<sup>4</sup>

Among the mythographers there were several interpretations of Urania's nature. Those of Diodorus Siculus<sup>5</sup> and Fulgentius<sup>6</sup> are somewhat eccentric and need not detain us. More to the purpose is the tradition found in Macrobius, Lilius Gyraldus, Natalis Comes, and others, to the effect that the Muses are really the Intelligences of the nine spheres, and that Urania is placed eighth and is so named because she is the spirit of the heaven of the fixed stars.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. L. Renwick, ed., *Complaints*, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, art. "Musen."

<sup>3</sup> *Theogony*, 1-84.

<sup>4</sup> *Quaest. Conviv.*, IX, 14.

<sup>5</sup> *Bibliotheca Historica*, IV, 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Mitologiarum Libri*, I, 48.

<sup>7</sup> Macrobius, *In Somn. Scipionis*, II, 3: "Theologi quoque novem musas, octe sphaerarum musicos cantus et unam maximam concinentiam quae consit

Although such a tradition does not directly explain Spenser's Urania, it does perhaps afford a step in the association of astronomy with theology.

Much more, however, could be made of Urania's name, and was. Two sixteenth-century mythographers whom Spenser may have known present an interpretation which comes closer to his conception. Lilius Gyraldus and Geoffroi Linocier say, in almost the same words, that Urania is so named "because she raises to heaven men who are learned and studious of her, or because glory and wisdom raise souls to celestial contemplation."<sup>8</sup> It is easy to see how this notion might lead to Spenser's idea of Urania. "Celestial contemplation" is substantially what he is talking about. But "celestial" carries several meanings; and while the writers cited thus far provide some of the elements in Spenser's Urania, the definitely religious element which we found to be the most important in Spenser is not found in any of them.

There are two bits of external evidence which lead one to turn to the French Huguenot poet DuBartas in this connection. Gabriel Harvey, in one of his marginalia, said that Spenser took special delight in the Fourth Day of the First Week of DuBartas, "which he esteems as the proper profession of Urania."<sup>9</sup> In the Envoy to *The Ruines of Rome*, after paying his respects to DuBellay, Spenser says,

ex omnibus esse voluere. Unde Hesiodus in theogonia sua octavam musam Uraniam vocat: quia post septem vagas, quae subiectae sunt, octava stellifera sphaera superposita proprio nomine coelum vocatur. . . ." Practically the same words are found in Lilius Gyraldus, *De Musis Syntagma, Opera Omnia*, pp. 564-5. The same is in Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae*, VII, 15. A later appearance of the tradition is in George Sandys, *Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished, Mythologized*, Oxford, 1632.

<sup>8</sup> Geoffroi Linocier, *Mythologia Musarum*, cap. IX (appended to the 1583 and later editions of Natalis Comes). The same words are found in Gyraldus, *op. cit.*, pp. 564-5.

<sup>9</sup> I. Gollancz, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1907, pp. 99-105, found prefixed to Gabriel Harvey's collection of travel books the following note: "It is not sufficient for poets to be superficial humanists; but they must be exquisite artists, and curious universal scholars; Mr. Digges hath the whole of the Aquarius of Palingenius by heart, and takes delight to repeat it often. Mr. Spenser conceives the like pleasure in the fourth day of the first Week of Bartas which he esteems as the proper profession of Urania."

And after thee, gins *Bartas* hie to rayse  
His heavenly Muse, th'Almightie to adore.

If we turn to the Fourth Day of the First Week to see what "the proper profession of Urania" is, we find substantially the same subject matter as that of the passage in *The Teares of the Muses*. The whole book, of course, deals with the creation of the world; we remember that Spenser's Urania teaches of "the world's creation." This particular section deals with the creation of the heavens and the heavenly bodies. The zodiac and the seven planets are fully described. Near the end we find the same transition from knowledge of Astronomy to knowledge of God. All these things, DuBartas says, are controlled not by the Stoic's Destiny, but by God and in them is His Providence.

Therefore (the rather) we below  
Should study all, their Course and Force to know  
To th'end that . . .  
We might unpuff our heart and bend our knee  
T'appease with sighs God's wrathfull Majestie.<sup>10</sup>

Worship and knowledge of God through a study of his works is a theme common enough in poetry as in theology. It is a part of the general tradition of Christian mysticism and is found in such various disciplines as Calvinism and Neo-Platonism. Spenser's best expression of the theme is in the *Hymne of Heavenly Beautie*, lines 22-105. There is no special significance to our argument in its appearance in its appearance in DuBartas and in Spenser. There is significance, however, in the fact that Spenser considered this theme, as treated by DuBartas, to be "the proper profession of Urania."

DuBartas' *Urania*, to which Spenser is probably alluding in *The Ruines of Rome*, illustrates further this conception of the Muse. In it he says that, after he had tried his hand at various secular kinds of poetry, Urania appeared to his.

I am Urania (then aloud, said shee)  
Who humane kinde above the Poles transporte  
Teaching their hands to touch and eyes to see  
All th'entercourse of the Celestiall Court.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Since the argument does not depend on verbal parallels we have used Sylvester's translation of DuBartas, ed. Grosart, I, lines 522-7.

<sup>11</sup> Sylvester's translation, ed. Grosart, I, 3-7.



She bids him follow her and

Soar up to Heav'n: Sing me th'almighties praise.

The other Muses deal in madrigals and now are "made Bawds to Lovers."<sup>12</sup> All our holy songs are profaned and

Men's eyes are sield-up with Cimmerian mist.<sup>13</sup>

Although men now "wallow in foule delights"<sup>14</sup> and pervert the Muses to base purposes, poetry originally sang the highest mysteries. So sang David and Moses, who were inspired by me.<sup>15</sup> She ends by urging the poet to take as his theme "His high praise who makes the Heavens goe round."

We saw that in the interpretations of the mythographers some of the elements in Spenser's conception of Urania are implicit. She is the "heavenly" Muse who leads men to study of the stars and to "celestial contemplation." But the definitely religious element is explicit only in DuBartas. Given Harvey's note and Spenser's allusion in *The Ruines of Rome*, and given the fact that substantially the same conception of Urania is to be found in both poets, it becomes fairly probable that a relationship exists. It seems reasonable to say that Spenser was not "forgetting the Muse" when he made Urania speak in *The Teares of the Muses*, but that he had a fairly definite conception of her as the Spirit who leads men through the study of the works of nature to the contemplation of the Heavenly Hierarchy and of God himself, and that, in so regarding her, he was largely indebted to the leading religious poet of contemporary France.

Such a conception of Urania naturally calls to mind the "Heavenly Muse" of Milton. It is not our purpose here to argue for a definite influence of Spenser and DuBartas on Milton's Muse. However, in view of the fact that Milton read and pondered both of them, one suggestion may be made by way of conclusion. In the invocation to Urania which opens Book VII of *Paradise Lost*, Milton shows that he is well aware of the difference between the pagan Muse, "an empty dreame," and his own heavenly guide. We have seen that in Spenser and DuBartas the pagan Muse had be-

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Teares of the Muses*, 379-384, 412-4.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Teares of the Muses*, 253 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Teares of the Muses*, 481-498.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Paradise Lost*, I, 6-12, and see the last paragraph below.

come the patroness of Christian mystical contemplation. It does not seem improbable that when Milton took Urania as the Muse of his Christian epic and called her the inspirer of Moses and David himself, he was helped in his Christianizing of a pagan myth by what he found in the two earlier poets.

H. G. LOTSPEICH

*Princeton University*

[The proof of this article was corrected by the author on the day before he died in November. The Editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES would express their sorrow over the loss of one who to the end showed such courageous devotion to scholarship.—THE EDITORS.]

---

### THOMAS EDWARDS AND THE EDITORSHIP OF THE FAERIE QUEENE

Upton refers to *The Faerie Queene* published in 1751 as "Mr. Kent's edition" which "Mr. Birch . . . printed."<sup>1</sup> Walpole reports Kent's drawings for it were "a very favourite work" of the artist, "exceedingly cried up by his admirers" but "in proportion" disappointing to the public.<sup>2</sup> Kent died, however, in 1748. Thereafter Brindley, the bookseller, promoted the work. In the proposals, July 1, 1751, in the newspaper advertisements, and on the title-page of the edition no name appeared save that of Kent though both the "new life" of Spenser and the glossary were mentioned. Letters of Thomas Edwards suggest that Edwards was among those whom Brindley solicited for editorial assistance. On March 9, 1750, the prospective editor wrote Daniel Wray that he would be "very glad to see and willing to contribute" what he could towards "a good edition" of Spenser though he had no "great opinion of the undertaker." He considered the possibility in some detail: the first quarto, the first folio, and Hughes' edition should be collated to insure a correct text; the "old" orthography observed save where the same word was spelled differently "as by accident"; and "the glossary, parallel places and everything else" omitted unless printed later in a "supplemental volume" together with "the rest of Spenser's works." Edwards had not entirely

<sup>1</sup> *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Upton, II, 596.

<sup>2</sup> *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, ed. 1782, IV, 241.

acquiesced however; for he dreaded the tedious business of "correcting the press." The fact that the six stanzas of "the specimen" had been printed with ninety-five lections varying from the quarto made him no less reluctant. Moreover he was dubious as to how his "bent" was to be communicated to Brindley. But whatever his decision, he did not intend to give the promoter his "pains." He wished Wray to "make a bargain" for him if he undertook the work.<sup>3</sup>

Edwards' admiration for Spenser was well-known among his friends. Samuel Richardson after inveighing against Newton's edition of *Paradise Lost* exclaimed to him, "Your Spenser too, they tell me!"<sup>4</sup> Edwards replied that having looked over the proposals for Brindley's version he feared "poor Spenser" would be "even worse treated than either Milton or Spenser." In a "picture-loving" age—a hit at what Walpole called Kent's "most execrable performance"<sup>5</sup>—he saw no end to the "scandalous injuries" being done to English "classic" authors till they were rescued from the booksellers, who instead of waiting till they could get a good edition "procure a competency of cuts, publish proposals, levy subscriptions, and then beat about for an undertaker, no matter whom the cheaper the better."<sup>6</sup> But if Spenser were "murdered," Edwards himself would not leave the poet "unrevenged." On April 5<sup>7</sup> he was still doubtful as to how he was to undertake his work, whether to beg subscriptions or let himself out as a hackney to Brindley "at so much a sheet" while Brindley made a "little fortune" by his labors. The "exclusive right" the booksellers claimed to English "classic" poets made it impossible to publish without their assistance, which they so exerted that if one author did not come down to their price, they would find another who would. Such was Brindley's method, for by April 12<sup>8</sup> Edwards had learned that Dr. Thomas Birch had agreed to supervise the 1751 *Faerie Queene*.<sup>9</sup> Though he did not question

<sup>3</sup> *Thomas Edwards' Letters*, Bodl. MS. 1011.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, letter dated March 19, 1750-1.

<sup>5</sup> *Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Cunningham (1857), II, 257.

<sup>6</sup> *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. A. L. Barbauld, III, 11-18.

<sup>7</sup> *Letter to the Honorable Philip Yorke*, dated April 5, 1751, Bodl. MS. 1011.

<sup>8</sup> Letter to Daniel Wray, dated April 12, 1751, Bodl. MS. 1011.

<sup>9</sup> Since his earlier letter to Wray, Edwards had more carefully con-

his "friend Birches care and attention," Edwards doubted his "itability" in Spenser owing to his preoccupation with "more important matters."<sup>10</sup> He thought he could prepare a "good" text himself "by the next spring." Hence on May 5, he wrote to Wray that he had been "wholly taken up by Spenser," and that "so much as frequently tired his eyes."<sup>11</sup> He was not without concern for Brindley's "folly," however, for he feared this edition would hinder "a complete one's being put out" since probably the few who read Spenser would "furnish themselves with this Picture book," eliminating "farther demand."

He was still "hard at work upon Spenser" when he wrote Richardson<sup>12</sup> but to no avail save his "own private satisfaction" for he and Brindley had failed to agree owing to the latter's haste. "Wilfull will do't, that's his crest," Edwards quoted in exasperation, which was quite true for when Richardson wrote next,<sup>13</sup> Brindley was about to advertise. The novelist, eager to save "that divine author" from "the vampplot," urged Edwards to precede him in notification, and thereafter execute "a new edition" of "his Spenser" such as might be "the standard . . . and so go down" with his name to "future times." But even now another issue was in the offing for Richardson included in his message a

sidered the notes, for he remarks in his letter that it "will be a hard matter to steer between too little and too much," many things in Spenser being "plain" to those, "who are conversant with the authors of that age, and with romantic history, which will be Greece to those who are only read in the moderns," a criticism as to Spenser's "romanticisms" before Warton's *Observations* (1754) or Upton's edition (1758), which particularly emphasized this feature of the poem.

<sup>10</sup> A letter from Warburton to Birch (May 27, 1738) points to there having been more than one projected edition of Spenser at the turn of the half-century and to Birch's interest in the poet: "I was desired by the Master of Peterhouse [John Whalley], who is about to publish Spenser, to enquire whether Fenton, who published Waller and he hears had an intention of publishing Spenser, left any papers on that subject behind him, and how they are to be procured if he did. I take the liberty of applying to you, as the properest person to give me information" (John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, II, 87-88).

<sup>11</sup> Letter to Wray, dated May 5, 1751, Bodl. MS. 1011.

<sup>12</sup> Letter dated May 8, 1751, *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, II, 19-24.

<sup>13</sup> May 27, 1751. *Richardson MS.*, Forster Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

copy of *A Letter Concerning A New Edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene*, "from the author," John Upton. Hence on June 8, Edwards wrote to Yorke that "in this affair of Spenser," they seemed to be playing at "the Parson has lost his fuddling cap," for the latter "would charge" him with it, he "would throw it off on Mr. West," and "Mr. West as it should seem on Mr. Upton," which last Edwards thought would do if West "oversaw" the work and corrected "the impetuosity" of Upton.<sup>14</sup>

It seems evident that Edwards really wanted to edit Spenser, and would have if he could have made a satisfactory arrangement with an undertaker and been able to drive himself to the laborious duties of an editor. He found it easier to attack criticism than to originate it. Witness his *Canons of Criticism*. But whatever he actually thought, Edwards was still interested in the edition for on June 10, he urged Arthur Onslow to prevail upon West to aid Upton that "a tolerably correct" edition might be secured.<sup>15</sup> He "longed" to see Brindley's work but thought "he must have made more haste than good speed to get it ready . . . so soon." By June 19<sup>16</sup> he had not only seen Upton's *Letter to West* but from what he had heard "passed the other day between" Upton and "Mr. Brindley's man," Birch, of course, he thought it "plain" Upton was about an edition which he again surmised would be "a good one" if overseen by West. He accepted kindly Richardson's "exhortations . . . in regard to Spenser" but he was discouraged. Others were "forwarder" in the work than he; "some persons or other" claimed a right to the copy, necessitating the collaboration of "the vampers," to Edwards, the real fly in the ointment. He would "consider" the matter "further" though he would not be willing to advertise till he was ready to publish "lest any dislike to the work, or other accident" should make him worse than his word! In an undated letter to Daniel Wray,<sup>17</sup> he thanked the latter for "refusing Mr. Brindley's offer" in his name for he "ought not to accept such a present from a stranger" particularly since he could have only one reason for making it, and that, one which pleaded strongly against Edwards' accepting it. Obviously, Brindley was angling for the critic's assistance.

<sup>14</sup> Letter dated June 8, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

<sup>15</sup> Letter dated June 10, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

<sup>16</sup> *Letter to Richardson, Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, III, 24-26.

<sup>17</sup> Undated but following the letter to Richardson, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

On August 13, Edwards' "longing" was in part satisfied. He had seen the first volume of the 1751 *Faerie Queene*.<sup>18</sup> Although he could not say much "for the cuts either in respect of the designs or the execution," by "Mr. Birch's diligence" the text would be "more correct" than that of any other, which was quite true for Birch was the first editor to collate the earlier versions. By August 23 he had gone through "the edition" as well as he could without having the "old" one to compare and had found most of the errors chargeable to the "ignorance and negligence" of the printers.<sup>19</sup> He had also seen and disapproved of Upton's "specimen," which he doubted Upton could get two hundred subscribers for.<sup>20</sup> Three days later he again commended the "pains" Birch had taken, adjudging his the "best edition . . . yet published," and adequate to "supersede the necessity of another."<sup>21</sup> Brindley's angling or friendship for Birch had led to Edwards' having a small share in the edition. He thanked Birch on October the first for his "Spenser," which after he had "found advertised for a short time," he had worked at "as hard" as he could to "send . . . the Errata as soon as possible."<sup>22</sup> His minor participation in the edition perhaps prejudiced his later opinion.

*The London Daily Advertiser and Literary Gazette* announced the proposals for Upton's edition on July 26, 1751, whereupon Richardson wrote Edwards<sup>23</sup> that people were "sorry" Upton had undertaken "your Spenser." He enclosed "a specimen and proposal . . . printed with the concurrence of the Tonsons," whose property the work "was supposed to be."<sup>24</sup>

Edwards' correspondence reveals nothing more of his interest in Spenser till he wrote the Rev. Mr. Lawry<sup>25</sup> that he had seen Newton's second volume of Milton<sup>26</sup> and agreed with him that

<sup>18</sup> Letter to Arthur Onslow dated Aug. 13, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

<sup>19</sup> Letter to Daniel Wray, dated Aug. 23, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

<sup>20</sup> Upton advertised for three hundred. See the *Whitehall Evening-Post* for July 27-30.

<sup>21</sup> Letter to Richardson, dated Aug. 26, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

<sup>22</sup> *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane 4305*.

<sup>23</sup> Letter dated July 27, 1751, *Richardson MS.*, Forster Collection.

<sup>24</sup> Fair proof that the Tonsons had secured the right to it before they published their octavo (1758). See "The 1758 Editions of the *Faerie Queene*," *MLN.*, April 1933, 229.

<sup>25</sup> March 27, 1753, *Bodl. MS. 1012*.

<sup>26</sup> *Paradise Regained*, ed. 1752.

Thyer was the "best qualified" to edit Spenser "of all those" who had given any "specimen of their critical capacity." Yet, he was curious as to Upton's progress, for he asked, "How does your Brother Prebendary go on with his work?" He apprehended the public would be "overrun with editions of Spenser" for "Sympson too" was "about publishing him."<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless on April 23 (1753), he urged Arthur Onslow<sup>28</sup> to promote an edition by Thyer as an undertaking suitable to his character as the "patron of the Learned." But neither Sympson's nor Thyer's *Faerie Queene* appeared, and Upton's was long in coming. That was all. Edwards died four years later (1757), having contributed only to the correction of the text in the 1751 edition. Failure to make a satisfactory arrangement with a publisher and distaste for the tedious business of an editor had inhibited his own edition.

JEWEL WURTSBAUGH

*The University of Oklahoma*

---

## THE PRINTING OF JOHN HUGHES' EDITION OF SPENSER, 1715

In 1715 was published the first scholarly edition of Spenser's works, edited by John Hughes and printed for Jacob Tonson, in six volumes, 12mo. It was issued in two sizes, one on large (royal) paper and one on small paper;<sup>1</sup> the large paper copies were issued to subscribers, a list of whose names was printed in the first volume. This list follows immediately after the dedication and begins a new signature, \*a-[\*a5v].<sup>2</sup> The absence of the list from *H*<sub>1b</sub> is not

<sup>27</sup> Sympson had previously edited Beaumont and Fletcher. Newton refers to his anticipated Spenser (*Paradise Regained*, A<sub>2</sub> verso).

<sup>28</sup> *Bodl. MS. 1012*.

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to as *H*<sub>1a</sub> and *H*<sub>1b</sub> respectively. I use the copies in the Tudor and Stuart Club of the Johns Hopkins University.

<sup>2</sup> The pagination is (ix)—xviii. The list accounts for two hundred and fifteen sets and contains the names of many notables of the period, including Addison, Blackmore, Sir Godfrey Kneller, Peter Motteux, Matthew Prior, "Mr. Phillips," Pope, "Horatio Walpole, jun. Esq.," Richard West, many of the nobility, and descendants of persons mentioned in Spenser's dedicatory sonnets and other poems.

noticeable, because of the separate signature and of the new pagination at the beginning of the next section. A comparison of the remainder of the preliminary material<sup>3</sup> shows that it is identical in the two sizes and printed from the same type. The text, however, beginning with "A Letter of the Authors" and continuing through a part of the *Faerie Queene*, is not from the same setting. Throughout the remainder of Volumes I and II, and to page 592, [Cc12<sup>v</sup>], in Volume III the initial letters, headpieces, tailpieces, other ornaments, swash letters, and the like are all different, indicating, obviously, a re-setting of the type. From page 593 (Dd) in Volume III to the end of Volume VI the pages are identical and from the same setting of type.

In the first volumes there are, in addition to the differences in type, many variations in readings. The following are the variants for Book I of the *Faerie Queene*, made up from the list of readings in the table of variants in the first volume of the *Variorum Spenser*:

Page in Hughes	<i>Faerie Queene</i> I	Variorum reading	Large paper	Small paper
94	6. xxiv. 5	teare	tear	rear
95	6. xxx. 9	lore	Lore	Love
97	6. xxxviii. 2	shall I	shall I	I shall
104	7. xii. 3	him did	him did	did him
109	7. xxxv. 1	No	No	Ne
116	8. v. 6	bowre	Bower	Bowers
123	8. xxxiii. 1	asked	asked	added
125	8. xliii. 7	whom	whom	when
128	9. Arg. 1	<i>loues</i>	<i>Loves</i>	<i>Love</i>
131	9. xiv. 4	iust	just	a just
163	11. xiii. 2	enraunged	enranged	enraged
165	11. xxiii. 1	His	His	The <sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Collation: Frontispiece; [A1], Title; A2-[A4<sup>v</sup>], Dedication; \*a-[\*a5], Subscribers to the Royal Paper of Spenser's Works [large paper only]; a-[a11<sup>v</sup>], The Life of Mr. Edmund Spenser; Illustration; [a12], Subtitle: An Essay on Allegorical Poetry with Remarks on the Writings of Mr. Edmund Spenser; b-[e9], Essay and Remarks; [e10]-[f12<sup>2</sup>], A Glossary. (Two sheets of this last gathering were used for the "Advertisement" and Rejected Stanzas inserted in the end of Volume III. In our small paper copy these sheets remain with the Glossary in Vol. I, the printer having failed to cut them off. The gathering is folded as is usual for a 12mo without cutting [cf. McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 169-172], with resulting confusion to the pagination and order of the sheets.) The text begins with signature B and page 1.

<sup>4</sup> I did not have the opportunity to examine both these copies until



It will be seen from the table above that in every case  $H_{1a}$  has the correct reading and  $H_{1b}$  a careless printer's error.  $H_{1b}$  gives every evidence of having been set up hurriedly and printed without proof-reading. The explanation seems to be that the 1715 edition was first designed for subscribers only and that after enough copies of the first volumes to supply the subscribers were run off, the type for a part was distributed. It was then decided to issue a trade edition on smaller paper. The distributed type had to be re-set hurriedly, and no opportunity was given for proof reading. The custom of the time was to issue such a work in an edition for subscribers, and it is unthinkable that Hughes would solicit subscribers to a large paper edition of a work already in progress in a less handsome format. I conclude, therefore, that  $H_{1b}$  represents a hurried re-setting from  $H_{1a}$ <sup>5</sup>. The necessity for enlarging the edition indicates an unsuspected interest in Spenser in the first quarter of the Eighteenth Century.

RAY HEFFNER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

Volumes I and II of the *Variorum* were already in print, but I have included the variants between the two printings of Hughes in Volume III. In a forthcoming Volume (Book VI) the reading for Books I and II will be listed in the errata. Mr. Douglas Hamer lists in his review of Book I (*RES.*, x, 220) most of the above variants as errors on the part of the editors. The truth of the matter is that Professor Padelford was using a small paper copy and Mr. Hamer was checking his readings in a large paper copy. Mr. Hamer, unconscious of the two printings, was somewhat confused—and a little alarmed—by the “errors.”

<sup>5</sup> One might argue that the reverse is true, that  $H_{1a}$  represents a correction of  $H_{1b}$ . One reading would support such a view; in Volume III, p. 367 (*F. Q.*, III, i, arg. 3), the  $H_{1a}$  reads correctly “Malecasta’s” and the  $H_{1b}$ , following the quartos and folios, reads incorrectly “Materasta’s.” It might seem here that in preparing  $H_{1a}$  the compositor, or proof reader, noticed the correct spelling of the word further on in the text and corrected it. (It is hardly possible that he referred to the “Faults Escaped” in the 1590 edition, where the error is corrected, for there is no other indication of any use of the 1590 quarto or of “F. E.”) It is more likely, I think, that  $H_{1b}$  was set from an uncorrected proof and therefore retained an error which had been corrected in the first setting. This error is also retained in the 1750 reprint. In fact, the presence of most of the careless errors of  $H_{1b}$  in the 1750 reprint indicated that the latter was set from the former. The basic text for the 1715 edition was the 1609 folio. The 1750 reprint frequently goes back to the 1590 quarto for a reading, but the 1715 editor seems never to have gone behind the folio.

TWO NOTES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF *MUTABILITIE*

In a recent article<sup>1</sup> I sought to demonstrate the relationship between Arthur Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses* and Spenser's Garden of Adonis episode. Several pertinent verbal parallels were there presented which create a presumption that Spenser relied upon Golding to an extent not inconsiderable, when the poet's usual transformation of his sources is kept in mind. It is not surprising, therefore, that evidence of verbal borrowing from Golding is present in Spenser's other treatise on permanence and flux, the *Cantos of Mutabilitie*.

Spenser, in 7. 7. 25, gives us a compact description of the four elements in transmutation. In a passage equally concise (xv, 270), Golding treats the same problem. Spenser writes that the elements change, one into the other, "The Fire to Ayre, and the Ayre to *Water sheere*," Golding that "the earth resolving leysurely dooth melt to *water sheere*."<sup>2</sup> This parallel could, of course, be a coincidence, but in view of Spenser's use of Golding in the Garden of Adonis, and the fact that *Mutabilitie* is filled with Ovidian pagentry, direct borrowing or verbal exactness of memory is rendered probable. If so, there is evident one more case of Spenser's use of Golding as a philosophical and scientific reference book.

A second matter for consideration here is an observation intended to supplement my article on the philosophical doctrine of the Mutability Cantos.<sup>3</sup> The concluding stanzas of the Mutability fragment state: first, that things conquer change by "turning to themselves at length againe," and reaching perfection by fate; secondly, that victory over change is attainable through amalgamation with the "Sabbaoth God." I sought to show that these two concepts are Boethian and therefore part of English Renaissance tradition, and that they supplement each other instead of being at variance as some had supposed. I desire, however, to make the Boethian

<sup>1</sup> "The Philosophy of Spenser's Garden of Adonis," *PMLA.*, XLIX (1934), 501.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that Golding has earth changing to "water sheere," while Spenser has air doing so is easily explainable, for in Golding both these changes occur; the process is described first in forward and then in reverse order, according to the usual doctrine of the four elements. Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> "The Concluding Stanzas of *Mutabilitie*," *SP.*, xxx (1933), 193.

interpretation clearer by pointing out that the concept of things conquering change and achieving perfection by returning "to themselves," and that of change being transcended upon union with God, can be considered as one and the same philosophical doctrine. The Neo-Platonists viewed all creation as a series of "emanations" from God, at once the source and goal to which all being strove to return. The more remote the emanation the less the perfection of being; the nearer the return to the Source, the greater the perfection.<sup>4</sup> Hence, Spenser's doctrine that things achieve perfection and immutability by turning to themselves, may be interpreted as a declaration of the same concept he presents three stanzas later, namely that perfection and immutability are attained upon union with the Sabbaoth God. Such an interpretation remains Boethian inasmuch as the two aforementioned doctrines are merged in the *De Consolatione*, Book iv, Prose 6, which I adduced as an analogue of Spenser's conclusion.<sup>5</sup>

BRENTS STIRLING

University of Washington

---

#### IDENTIFICATIONS IN COLIN CLOUT'S COME HOME AGAINE

In the copy of Spenser's *Colin Clout's Come Home Again* (1595) now in the possession of Mr. Gabriel Wells of New York City, are some interesting notes written in a seventeenth-century hand.<sup>1</sup> Although the exact date of these notes can not be deter-

<sup>4</sup> Ficino, for example, puts the doctrine thus: "Of course, that supreme Author creates things one by one at first, hastens them away in the second place, perfects them in the third place. Also, in the beginning all things flow out from that perennial fountain when they are produced; then, they flow back into the same when they return again to their very origin. In the last place they are perfected after they return to their own origin." (*Com. in Con. Plat.*, II, 1. Transl. Sister Mary Ethelind, Univ. of Wash. Thesis, 1930.)

<sup>5</sup> Another expression of the notion is found at the end of III meter 2 and the beginning of III prose 3. See also III prose 10.

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Mr. Wells for his kindness in permitting me to examine this volume. The book came from the Robert Hoe collection and was at one time in the libraries of G. Walter Steeves and Jerome Kern.

mined, a reference to the 1605 edition of Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas indicates that they are later than that date. At the close of the letter to Raleigh (A<sub>2</sub>v) the annotator has copied these lines:

our mysterious Elfine Oracle.  
deepe, morall grave invencions miracle/

Below the ornament he identifies the quotation by the comment: "Josuah Silvester in his translacion of Dubartas works pa 272/." The quotation from Sylvester is repeated on the title page of *Astrophel* with the statement: "This was made by Josuah Silvester of Edmund Spenser." The quotation occurs in the opening passage of the *First Parte of the First Day of the Second Weeke of the Divine Weekes and Works* and is found on page 272 only in the 1605 edition.<sup>2</sup> Although it is impossible to do more than set 1605 as a *terminus a quo* for these notes, the handwriting would indicate a date not later than the middle of the seventeenth century when the secretarial hand was still in use.

The most interesting of these notes are those which identify certain characters in *Colin Clout*. The "scornfull lass" (l. 419) is "delia." Urania is "Ye Countess of Pembroke"; Theana is "Ye Countess of Warwick"; and Mansilia is "Ye Marchioness of Northampton." These identifications are in accord with the findings of later scholars. The sister of Theana, however, "Faire Marion the Muses only darling," who is usually said to be Margaret, Countess of Cumberland, sister of Anne, Countess of Warwick, is identified here as "Ye Countess of Huntington." This is not such an unlikely identification, since the Countess of Huntington was Catherine Dudley, sister of Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and thus sister-in-law to Theana. "Phyllis, Charyllis and sweet Amaryllis" are identified in the margin as:

"Ye Countess of Derby  
Ye Lady Compton and Montegle  
Ye Lady Hunsdon."

The fact that opposite Amaryllis (line 564) the annotator wrote "Ye Countess dowager of Derby widow unto Ferdinando late Earl of Derby" may give some clue to the order in reading the others. If Amaryllis is Countess of Derby, then Charillis is Lady Compton

<sup>2</sup>I am indebted to Dr. Louis B. Wright, who checked the editions of Sylvester in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

and Phyllis, Lady Hunsdon. The annotator follows tradition in calling Stella "Ye Lady Riche" in *Colin Clout* and also in *Astrophel* (lines 36, 55). This inaccuracy, for by Stella Spenser surely meant Lady Essex, shows the popularity of this tradition in the seventeenth century.

When he calls Amyntas "Sir Philip Sidney," he probably read the poem carelessly. Although Amintas in the *Faerie Queene*, III. vi. 45 is Sidney, Amyntas in *Colin Clout* is the Earl of Derby. The annotator, however, was interested in the Sidneys, for in *Astrophel* he identifies Clorinda as "Ye Countess of Pembroke" and writes "Mary Pembroke" at the bottom of G2v. Ignoring the other elegies, he makes a few notes on *An Epitaph on the Right Honourable sir Philip Sidney*. He identifies the king for whom Sidney is named (line 17) as "Phillip the 2 kinge of Spayne," and Sidney's Kentish home (line 21) as "Penshurst." Below this note he adds, "Penshurst was sometime the house of Sir Raphe Vane knight."<sup>3</sup>

The commentator marked certain passages in *Colin Clout* and *Astrophel* by overlining them or by using quotation marks in the left margin. The names of all the poets and unidentified ladies are overlined; and not only is the passage on Alabaster (lines 400-415) overlined but lines 407-409 are also marked by quotes. These lines urge Elizabeth to encourage him to complete his poem in her honor. The overlined passages are: lines 465-479; 659-683; 688-730 (703-713 marked by quotes); 757-762; and 771-782. These are all well known passages which treat of Spenser's devotion to "a Mayd," his realization of the court as unsuitable for a poet, and his bitter satire on the servile, flattering courtiers who degrade the noblest ideals of love. The lines from *Astrophel*, 23-24, 36, 89-90 and 49 (*L. of C.*), are in praise of Sidney and Stella, or are seventeenth-century commonplaces.<sup>4</sup>

A summary of these manuscript notes brings out the following points: (1) there is an authenticated Spenser allusion in Sylvester's work; (2) we have the earliest record of identifications of people mentioned in *Colin Clout*, a record dating somewhere between

<sup>3</sup> Penshurst became the property of Sir William Sidney in 1552 after Sir Ralph Vane (Fane) was executed for treason.

<sup>4</sup> Lines 471-2 in *CCCHA.* receive the obvious explanation in the margin, "Me[m]o of ye Request" and "doctor of Phishike."

1605 and the middle of the century; (3) with two exceptions these identifications tally with the discoveries of recent scholars; (4) the comments on *Astrophel* denote the continued interest in the Sidneys and the strength of the Stella-Lady Riche tradition; (5) the marked passages on the court, on Spenser, and the adumbrated personages indicate the popularity of these topics long after Spenser's own time.

KATHRINE KOLLER

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

### ELIZABETHAN CHIVALRY AND THE FAERIE QUEENE'S ANNUAL FEAST

Spenser's use of the Faerie Queene's annual twelve days' feast to motivate the action of his great poem has commonly been regarded as nothing more than the conventional story frame as it was employed by Boccaccio and Chaucer. But as I have shown elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> Elizabethan chivalry has an important place in *The Faerie Queene*, and Spenser's employment of the feast may well be a reflection of certain chivalric practices of the age rather than a mere reversion to the feast of the romances. This is all the more likely when one considers the resort to Arthurian convention in court festivals, the poet's habit of weaving into his work bits of material from the life of his time, and the capital place of *The Faerie Queene* in the treatment of the Tudor-Arthur return motif in Elizabethan literature. It is my purpose in this paper to show that, although the feast motif must ultimately go back to the romances, in all probability, it is also an allegorical treatment of some features of the revival of chivalry at Elizabeth's court.

In the Letter to Raleigh, Spenser writes, in part, in explaining the significance of the feast as the key to his structure:

In the beginning of the feast, there presented him selfe a tall clownishe younge man, who falling before the Queen of Faries desired a boone (as the manner then was) which during that feast she might not refuse: which was that hee might have the atchievement of any adventure which during that feaste should happen. . . .

---

<sup>1</sup> "Notes on Elizabethan Chivalry and *The Faerie Queene*," *SP.*, xxx (1933), 148-159.

Compare this with one of the incidents of Elizabeth's coronation banquet as reported by Holinshed:

In the mean time, whilst hir grace sat at dinner, sir Edward Dimmocke knight, hir champion by office, came riding into the hall in faire complet armor, mounted upon a beautifull courser, richlie trapped in cloth of gold, entred the hall, and in the midst thereof cast downe his gantlet: with offer to fight with him in hir quarrel, that should denie hir to be the righteous and lawfull queene of the realme. The queene taking a cup of gold full of wine, drank to him thereof, and sent it to him for his fee together with the cover.<sup>2</sup>

Detailed resemblances between the two passages there are, of course, none. Nevertheless, we find in both instances the appearance of the champion and the patent resort to Arthurian material. These coronation day festivities were observed, in January, from year to year during Elizabeth's reign, and the appearance of the champion was one of the regular occurrences—romance commonplace, certainly, but just the kind of commonplace that Spenser so often lifted from the life of his day and embroidered into the allegory of his poem.

The same general similarity to the passage quoted above from Spenser's letter is found in an account of the annual observance of Elizabeth's accession to the throne on November 17, also a revival of Saint Elizabeth's day in honor of the queen. This notable holiday is explained by Sir William Segar as follows:

. . . these annuall exercises in armes, solemnized the 17. day of November, were first begun and occasioned by the right vertuous and honourable Sir Henry Lea, Master of her highnesse Armories, and now deservingly Knight of the Most Noble Order, who, of his great zeale and earnest desire to eternize the glory of her maiesties court, in the beginning of her happy reigne, voluntarily vowed . . . during his life, to present himselfe at the tilt armed, the day aforesaid yeerely, there to performe, in honor of her sacred maiestie, the promise he formerly made. Whereupon the lords and gentlemen of the sayd court, incited by so worthy an example, determined to continue that custome, and . . . have ever since yeerely assembled in arms accordingly. . . .<sup>3</sup>

This display of chivalry, more or less regularly observed from 1570 to the close of the queen's reign, was the most elaborate of all the

<sup>2</sup> *Chronicles* (London, 1807-8), iv, 176.

<sup>3</sup> "The originall occasions of the yeerely triumphs in England," quoted by Dyce, ed., *Works of Greene and Peele* (London, 1861), p. 566.

knightly foregatherings of the age.<sup>4</sup> For the occasions of this exhibition in 1590 and in 1595 Peele supplied poems flattering the queen and her courtiers in the most fulsome terms.<sup>5</sup> On the latter occasion the pageantry was led by Essex,<sup>6</sup> and the speeches for the show were written by Francis Bacon, his one venture into pure belles lettres.<sup>7</sup> Considering the yearly observance of this exhibition, the jousting of the knights—among them Spenser's friends and patrons—it is probable that the poet drew upon this celebration of accession day, as well as upon the coronation banquets, when he planned the motivating force of his poem.

There is a third point of resemblance between this part of the allegory of *The Faerie Queene* and the actual life of the court. Saint George's Day, April 23, was solemnly observed by the queen and her Knights of the Garter. The ceremonies included a religious service in the court chapel, followed by a procession of the queen and the knights and heralds, all in their brilliant official costumes, about the courtyard and through the great hall of the castle. It was at this time, also, that new knights were elected to the Order.<sup>8</sup> A little later, usually in May or June, came the Feast of Saint George, which marked the official installation of those knights who had been elected to the Order in April. These Saint George celebrations, revolving about a band of knights originally organized by Edward III on the model of Arthur's Round Table and having, as I have already pointed out,<sup>9</sup> a significant part in the chivalry of Spenser's poem, also have a part in the background of the poet's use of the feast motif.

Finally, the Christmas holidays were another time of great entertainment at court. The season was spent in feasting, in the presentation of plays and masques, in the offering of rich New

<sup>4</sup> For the part played by Sir Henry Lea in these exercises, see Sara Ruth Watson's "The Queen's Champion," *Western Reserve Univ. Bulletin*, New Series, xxxiv, no. 13, 65-89.

<sup>5</sup> See Greene and Peele, *Works*, ed. Dyce, 569 ff., 595 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Sidney State Papers*, ed. Arthur Collins (London, 1746), I, 362.

<sup>7</sup> Bacon, *Works*, ed. Basil Montagu (Philadelphia, 1842), II, 533 ff.

<sup>8</sup> For detailed accounts of the pageantry of this occasion, see John Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1823), I, 67, 88-89; also *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. Nichols, *Camden Society Pub.*, No. 42 (1847-8), 232, 257-58, 280, 305-6.

<sup>9</sup> "Notes on Elizabethan Chivalry and *The Faerie Queene*," 156-59.



Year's gifts to the queen, and in a display of chivalry sometimes revealing the prowess of the knights in foot combats.<sup>10</sup> This was truly an annual twelve days' festival, extending as it usually did from Christmas to Twelfth-Night.

Obviously there are no direct parallels between any of the occasions I have cited and Spenser's explanation and use of the feast motif. This is, however, entirely beside the point, since I do not pretend that these festivals are to be considered source materials in a restricted sense. As influences they are to be grouped with the Kenilworth masques<sup>11</sup> and the fairy queen of the provincial pageants;<sup>12</sup> they are not immediate sources but episodes from the chivalric exercises of the Elizabethan court that, translated and transformed, find their way into the structural forces of a poem glorifying Elizabeth and the poet's friends and patrons in a day when the conventions of chivalry are shot through the literature and life of the age.

IVAN L. SCHULZE

*Texas State College for Women*

#### SYMBOLISM IN *FAERIE QUEENE*, II. 12

I have tried to show elsewhere<sup>1</sup> that a good many passages in *Faerie Queene*, II. 12, are at least susceptible of an allegorical interpretation. A few more may be added to the number. As Sir Guyon and the Palmer approach their destination, they are addressed by a band of five mermaids<sup>2</sup> who lure them with their sweet voices and their flattery. Spenser has in mind the Sirens, for he mentions their contest with the Muses. But the Sirens were three. It is natural to surmise that we have here a symbol of the five senses. An analogous case comes to mind. Fulgentius<sup>3</sup> ex-

<sup>10</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), I, 19.

<sup>11</sup> See Edwin Greenlaw, "Spenser's Fairy Mythology," *SP.*, xv (1918), 105-7.

<sup>12</sup> See C. R. Baskervill, "The Genesis of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," *MP.*, xviii (1920), 49-54.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "The Influence of Trissino on *The Faerie Queene*," *PQ.*, vii, 3 (1928); and "The Symbolism of the Classical Episodes in *The Faerie Queene*," *PQ.*, viii, 3 (1929).

<sup>2</sup> 2. 30. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Staveren, *Auctores mythographi latini*, Lyons, 1742, p. 682.

plains in this way the five daughters of Apollo,—Pasiphaë, Medea, Phaedra, Circe, and Dirce. The songs of the mermaids may not impossibly symbolize the allurements and the pride of the flesh. For a moment Sir Guyon is lulled into inaction by song and murmuring wave; then, thanks to his wise companion, he rouses himself from sensual contentment and faces the struggle.

The voyagers are nearing the shore when a dense fog envelops them, and birds of ill omen add horror to the gloom. The allegory is true to life. He who resists the will of nature in him does so in ignorance and even in fear of her might. Despite these obstacles, the two companions land; but they are now set upon by a monstrous rabble. The "wilde béasts"<sup>4</sup> probably represent the passions, or perhaps the opposition of the unreasoning and dissolute. The Palmer duly quells them with his staff. It will be recalled that Tasso's good magician performs a similar feat<sup>5</sup> with what was originally suggested to the poet by the rod of ashwood, feared of serpents.<sup>6</sup> Spenser, instead, has in mind the caduceus of Mercury.<sup>7</sup> Now Natalis Comes, perhaps following Macrobius,<sup>8</sup> interprets Mercury not only as eloquence but also as reason,<sup>9</sup>—"the divine spark which God infused into the minds of men," "the divine reason and wisdom of God, whence our souls are derived." In Argus we are to see anger, ready to take offence at a hundred things; and indeed reason conquers our angry passions. Rightly was Mercury believed to calm the turbulent ocean. Here we recall Sir Guyon's stormy voyage. As Upton says, the Palmer's staff represents reason, the wise man's magic wand.

Sir Guyon and the Palmer enter Acrasia's garden by the ivory gate of false earthly dreams; but the Knight is strong in his virtuous temperance, and disdainfully upsets Genius's tempting "mazer bowle."<sup>10</sup> Warton traced Genius to Natalis Comes,<sup>11</sup> who identifies the "bad Genius" of the ancients with those self-willed impulses which often cloud our reason and conscience.<sup>12</sup> It may

<sup>4</sup> 4. 9. 6.

<sup>5</sup> *Gerusalemme Liberata*, xv, 49.

<sup>6</sup> *Le Lettere di Torquato Tasso*, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1854, I, 197.

<sup>7</sup> 7. 41.

<sup>8</sup> *Saturnaliorum*, I, 19. Cf. Eyssenhardt's edition of complete works, Leipzig, 1893, p. 111.

<sup>9</sup> *Mythologiae*, Venice, 1581, v. 5. 296.

<sup>10</sup> 49. 3.

<sup>11</sup> I, 114.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, iv. 3. 195.

very well be, however, that Spenser used another source as well. Upton pointed out that Dame Excess, by whom the two companions are subjected to their next temptation, recalls a passage in the allegorical narrative attributed to Kebes of Thebes. Here we see the souls of men passing through a gate into life. At the gate stands Genius, who advises them as to their journey; hard by sits a smooth-spoken woman named Deceit, who offers them draughts of error and ignorance from her cup; further on await women, embodiments of desires and pleasures, who lead the travellers away. I think it probable that Spenser availed himself of this passage and its Platonic symbolism, but more extensively and originally than Upton seems to have perceived. In Genius the poet embodied the deceitful whispering of self-misleading impulse,—the first enemy virtue must contend with; in Dame Excess, with her luscious grapes and glittering gold, the intemperate gratification of impulse, the indulgence of desires in excessive pleasures. He who drinks of Genius's bowl lends an ear to the tempter within him and is ripe for actual incontinence. He who drinks of Dame Excess's cup will presently drink of Acrasia's also and turn into a brute; for, as Alanus says,<sup>13</sup> all forms of intemperance lead to the climax of sensuality. Spenser points to the road which goes from mental earthliness to general looseness of conduct, and thence to gross debauchery. Genius's mazer bowl may well have been associated in his mind with the Cup of Bacchus, which plunges into a forgetfulness of spiritual things the soul descending to earth<sup>14</sup> and keeps it in darkness after its incarceration in the body.<sup>15</sup> Sir Guyon, thanks to his good genius the Palmer, does not forget; nor does he listen to the smooth-spoken woman. Therefore he is able to resist the naked damsels who await further on.

I have pointed out elsewhere that the "trayle of yvie" which hangs, presumably, from a column in the center of Acrasia's fountain,<sup>16</sup> is probably a symbol of lust. Ivy is the plant of Bacchus, and Bacchus, identified with the sun, was familiar to the Stoics, to Plutarch, to the Neo-Platonists, as the embodiment of the mascu-

<sup>13</sup> *De planctu Naturæ*, Prose VI.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Macrobius, *Com. in somn. Scip.*, I, 12, *edit. cit.*, p. 532.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Plotinus, *Complete Works*, Alpine, Platonist Press, 1918, I, 127; Porphyry, *De antro nympharum*, tr. by T. Taylor, London, 1823, p. 34; Stewart, *The Myths of Plato*, New York, Macmillan, 1905, p. 240.

<sup>16</sup> 61. 2.

line principle in nature. Water stood for the feminine principle. Comes interprets both in this sense at some length.<sup>17</sup> Acrasia's fountain is as significant as a phallus would be. Hardly less so are the naked boys carved in the sides,—Cupids, presumably, for they seem "to fly about, playing their wanton toys."<sup>18</sup> To return to my starting-point, the meaning which Spenser attached to ivy is suggested by another passage in Book II. It will be recalled that in Canto V Atin, eager to avenge the discomfiture of Pyrochles, speeds off to his brother and finds that dissolute warrior in Acrasia's garden, lolling in the midst of her decidedly licentious maids and boys:

And over him Art, stryving to compayre  
With Nature, did an arber greene disprede,  
Framed of wanton yvie, flouing fayre,  
Through which the fragrant eglantine did sprede  
His prickling armes, entrayled with roses red.<sup>19</sup>

Roses were sacred to Venus, and judging by Sonnet XXVI the eglantine may well have been intended to suggest the thorns which make the rose of love but the more tempting. I have no doubt that Spenser understood the symbolism of "wanton yvie," with its "lascivious armes,"<sup>20</sup> perfectly.

All obstacles overcome, Sir Guyon and the Palmer descend upon the enchantress. The fair Acrasia is reclining on a bed of roses, her charms more than half revealed by "a vele of silke and silver thin" of which Spenser tells us that "more subtile web Arachne cannot spin."<sup>21</sup> The comparison is not an unusual one; but the fact remains that the spider's web was,<sup>22</sup> and still is, a common symbol of the snares which beset weak mortals. We recall Mammon's cave, too:

And over them Arachne high did lifte  
Her cunning web, and sprede her subtile nett.<sup>23</sup>

The two men who creep up to Acrasia unperceived are provided with a harsher net:

A subtile net, which onely for the same  
The skilfull Palmer formally did frame.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *Op. cit.*, x, 685.      <sup>18</sup> 60. 8.      <sup>19</sup> II. 5. 29.      <sup>20</sup> 61. 6.      <sup>21</sup> 77. 7.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Legouais *Ovide moralisé*, Cat's *Emblems*, etc.

<sup>23</sup> II. 7. 28.

<sup>24</sup> 81. 4-5.

A moment more and the enchantress and her lover are caught, just as Venus and Mars were, long ago. Spenser might very well have availed himself of a familiar classic episode without ulterior motives; yet Natalis Comes interprets that episode as follows:

And indeed what wicked man steeped in sin can long be happy? Not uncounted wealth, not crowds of friends, not nobility of descent, not empire, not armies, can indefinitely shield the sinner from deserved punishment, from the vengeance of God.<sup>25</sup>

The interpretation certainly fits our case. Despite her riches, despite her embattled lovers, the queen of the sensual falls at last.

CHARLES W. LEMMI

*Goucher College*

---

### THE SERPENT AND THE EAGLE IN SPENSER AND SHELLEY

The combat between the Red Cross Knight and Sansioy at the court of Lucifera is one of the most spirited encounters in the *Faerie Queene*; and indeed it should be, for the very natures of the antagonists are at daggers drawn. In the Red Cross Knight we see an embodiment of holiness, of eager desire to obey the will of God; in his opponent we see a rakehell and a rebel. It is Sansioy who wrests his brother's shield from the page,<sup>1</sup> rebelling against the law of arms, rebelling against court decorum, rebelling against whatever would restrain him. There is something satanic about Sansioy. The fight, then, is a fierce one, and Spenser illustrates it with a vigorous and striking simile:

So th'one for wrong, the other strives for right  
As when a Gryfon, seized of his pray,  
A Dragon fiers encountreth in his flight,  
Through widest ayre making his ydle way,  
That would his rightfull ravine rend away:  
With hideous horror both together smight,  
And souce so sore that they the heavens affray;  
The wise Southsayer, seeing so sad sight,  
Th'amazed vulgar telles of warres and mortall fight.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> II. 6. 103.

<sup>1</sup> I, 4, 39.

<sup>2</sup> I, 5, 8.

The last two lines suggest the probable source of this description. It will be recalled that in the twelfth book of the *Iliad* a serpent and an eagle appear struggling in mid-air above the Trojan army, and that the spectacle amazes the Trojans and is interpreted by Polydamas as an omen of disaster. But how curiously has our poet altered the Homeric episode. The serpent and the eagle have become a dragon and a griffin. In the case of the serpent there might be some doubt; for the word *dragon* was used with a certain latitude, in Spenser's times, and Chapman applies both terms to the Homeric reptile. But Spenser definitely means a proper or winged dragon. As for the eagle there can be no doubt at all. It is natural to wonder what recommended these substitutions.

A desire to avoid triteness may very well have been one of Spenser's motives for transforming the serpent and the eagle into something new. The combatants described by Homer are an almost wearisome commonplace in classic literature and elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> Again, an artist's eye for the picturesque may have had something to do with the matter. But were these the poet's only reasons? I think not; and if I am right, we have here a curious bit of symbolism entirely appropriate to the occasion and wholly characteristic of the great allegorist. The griffin has usually been associated with righteousness. The ancients related<sup>4</sup> how griffins guarded Scythian gold against the rapacity of travelers, and a glance at *Burke's Peerage* is sufficient to establish the fact that in heraldry the griffin was a familiar symbol of righteous tenacity. Nor is this all. One of the most striking passages in *Physiologus* goes as follows:

The Griffin is the largest bird of all the birds of heaven. It lives in the far East in an inlet of the ocean-stream. And, when the sun rises over the water-depths and lights the world with its beams, the Griffin spreads out its wings and receives the rays of the sun. And another rises with it, and the two fly together towards the sunset, as it is written: "Spread thy wings, dispenser of light; give the world light."

In like manner stand the two Griffins for the Godhead, that is for the Archangel Michael and the Holy Mother of God, and they receive thy spirit, so that it may not be said: "I know you not."

Well now spake Physiologus concerning the Griffin.

<sup>3</sup> *Aeneid*, XI; *Metamorphoses*, IV, 712 seq.; Pliny, *Naturalis historiae*, x, 5; Gesner, *Historiae animalium*, v; *Orlando Furioso*, x, 103; etc.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Herodotus, *History*, III, 16; and especially Solinus, *Rerum memorabilium*, xv, 10, where it is declared that the griffins tear depredators to pieces "velut geniti ad plectendam avaritiæ temeritatem."

In Dante the griffin stands for Christ. The great stone griffin at Verona holds down the writhing form of the Old Dragon.<sup>5</sup> Truly: "So th'one for wrong, the other strives for right."

As we read the first canto of the *Revolt of Islam*, we again behold the struggle in mid-air; and again are reminded of the *Iliad*. I do not mean to imply that the fight between the serpent and the eagle is derived entirely from this source; indeed, much of it more closely recalls the *Æneid*.<sup>6</sup> Yet not Virgil's but Homer's eagle drops the huge reptile and speeds away with a cry "down the gusts of the wind." Doubtless Shelley had both descriptions in mind; but in any case Virgil was himself indebted to Homer. Fundamentally, then, we have here the same material used by Spenser. We almost lose sight of the fact in our startled sense of contrast. The Serpent has become a saint. "Oh Gemini," might say Lucian's much wondering Micyllus "who ever would have thought it possible!" Perhaps Eve would,—Eve in a Godwinian sequel to *Paradise Lost*. I wish I might persuade myself that Godwin inspired the tender scene on the shore; but much more probably Boiardo did. In the famous Italian's masterpiece, Orlando, having reached the shore of a certain lake, sees a lady there, tenderly weeping over a dead dragon. Orlando stops in some astonishment; but how much greater is his amazement when the lady takes the monster in her arms and with it enters a little boat which immediately speeds away.<sup>7</sup> The next canto identifies the

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, New York, Merrill and Baker, 1873, III, 140.

<sup>6</sup> I refer, of course, to Book XI, 751-756.

<sup>7</sup> *Orlando Innamorato*, ed. Panizzi, Pickering, 1831, II, xii, 59-60:

Così mirando vide morto un drago,  
Ed una dama con pietosa ciera  
Piangea quel drago morto in su la riva,  
Com'ella fusse di suo amante priva.

La Dama il drago morto in braccio piglia,  
E con quello entra in una navicella,  
Correndo giù per l'acqua a la seconda,  
E in mezzo il lago appunto si profonda.

It will be recalled that in the first canto of *The Revolt of Islam* Shelley relates how, standing by the sea, he beheld a combat between a serpent and an eagle (stanzas 8-14); and how a beautiful woman, who had also watched the encounter, gathered the wounded serpent in her arms (stanzas

lady as the enchantress Morgana, who has turned the young knight Ziliante into a dragon in the vain hope that he may frighten away intruders on her domain without danger to himself. In her palace at the bottom of the lake, Morgana restores the youth to life and to his proper form. Not impossibly, this same episode had some influence on *Prometheus Unbound* as well; for it is in the name of Demogorgon, stronger than all other spirits or powers, that Orlando presently sets Morgana's captive free.<sup>8</sup>

CHARLES W. LEMMI

Goucher College

### A BRACE OF VILLAINS

*Arden of Feversham* was printed for the first time in 1592 and the fifth book of *The Faerie Queene* was not published until four years later. Nevertheless an odd parallel between the description of the villain Malengin in the *F. Q.* and another villain in *Arden* suggests that the passage in *Arden* is later than the other, so that the manuscript version of this part of *F. Q.* must have been in existence as early as 1592 at least.

There are several reasons for thinking the *Arden* passage later. The language is in part Spenserese; the description is more detailed than that of Spenser, although following the same order; the passage has no source in Holinshed, whose account the anonymous author of *Arden* followed closely; the thief so carefully described is of no consequence in the play, so that such a clear portrait—far clearer than that given the major actors—is not needed. Altogether the evidence suggests that the author of *Arden* merely found the scarecrow in another man's field and added to his picturesque rags.

If the author of *Arden* was Kyd, as many scholars believe, this procedure seems the more natural and likely. Kyd often uses Spenserisms; in *Soliman and Perseda* he has passages which strongly suggest *F. Q.*; snapping up of unconsidered trifles was, moreover, a pastime of his. This borrowing is much in his man-

16-20) and, accompanied by the poet, glided away in "a boat of rare device" (stanzas 22-23) to the Temple of the Spirit. Here the story of Cythna and Laon, which occupies the rest of the poem, was presently told.

<sup>8</sup> II, 13, 29.



ner. The thief is an insignificant fellow who never appears on the stage, but we know from face to foot-gear how this non-actor looks. Spenser had described him, and Kyd, or some other if Kyd be not the author of *Arden*, supplied all concrete details except one.

Full dreadfull wight he was, as ever went  
*Vpon the earth*, with *hollow eyes* deepe pent,  
 And *long curled lockes* that *downe his shoulders shagged*,  
 And on his back an uncouth vestiment  
 Made of straunge stuffe, but *all to-worne* and ragged,  
 And underneath his breach was *all to-torne* and jagged.  
*F. Q.*, V, ix, 10.

Except for the eyes and the hair this is not highly specific. The version in *Arden* is an identification:

*Brad.* . . . so vile a rogue as he  
 Lyves not againe upon the earth . . .  
*A leane faced writhen knaue*,  
 Hauke nosde and verye *hollow eied*, . . .  
*Long haire downe his shoulders curled*; . . .

*Will.* What apparell had he?

*Brad.* A watchett sattin doublet *all to torne*, . . .  
 A paire of velvet threadbare hose, seame rent,  
 A worsted *stocking rent about the shoe*,  
 A livery cloake, but all the lace was of.

*Arden of Feversham*, II, i, ed. Brooke in *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 12.

Those details, however, which seem not to have been furnished by *F. Q.* may be found elsewhere in Spenser:

The ape clad souldier-like. . . .  
 In a blew jacket. . . .  
 With manie slits. . . .  
 And his *hose broken high above the heeling*,  
 And his *shoes* beaten out with travelling.  
*Mother Hubbard's Tale*, 207-8.

MARION GRUBB

*Tennessee College*

## KYD'S BORROWING FROM GARNIER'S *BRADAMANTE*

Although Thomas Kyd translated a French tragedy, *Cornélie*, by Robert Garnier, and adapted a French tale by Jacques Yver, little investigation has been made into his possible use of French sources

in his original work. A few lines in *The Spanish Tragedy* are supposed to have been suggested by a short passage in *Cornélie*;<sup>1</sup> a few lines in *Arden of Feversham* are supposed to have been suggested by *Cornélie*.<sup>2</sup> Neither of these parallels is very striking.

Since Kyd was an inveterate borrower, and his so-called original work is anything but original in detail, we should expect him to take advantage of an opportunity to draw upon the other plays of Garnier. These other plays, except *Bradamante*, the one tragi-comedy, were available in the edition of 1585 used by him for his translation. There are evidences here and there that he did use them, but these evidences have to do with vocabulary and phrasing rather than with direct parallels. He might have made use of *Bradamante* in the edition of 1582.<sup>3</sup> Certainly one bit of braggadocio in *Soliman and Perseda* offers so close a parallel with *Bradamante* that if Kyd read it at all, he probably drew upon it for this passage:

Sooth to say, the earth is my country  
As the aire to the fowle, or the marine moisture  
To the red guild fish . . .  
Each place is my habitation;  
Therefore each country's word is mine to pronounce . . .  
And where a man liues well, there is his country.

*Soliman and Perseda*, I, iii, 79-81, 112-13; IV, ii, 7.

The corresponding passage in *Bradamante* has the same sententious tone, and it employs the same figures: world-country, air-birds, fish-sea, etc. In both instances the passage is built around a proverb, the same Latin proverb: *Patria est ubicumque est bene*.

Seule on ne doit priser la contrée où nous sommes,  
Tout ce terrestre rond est le pais des hommes,  
Comme l'air des oiseaux, et des poissons la mer:  
Vn lieu comme vn estuy ne nous doit enfermer . . .  
Le pais est partout où l'on se trouue bien.  
La terre est aux mortels une maison commune:  
Dieux seme en tous endroits nostre bonne fortune.

*Bradamante*, 580-83, 587-9, ed. Foerster, Heilbronn, 1883.

No similar passage is to be found in the source of *Soliman and Perseda*, Henry Wotton's *Courtlie Controuersie of Cupids Cautels*,

<sup>1</sup> Kyd, *Works*, ed. Boas, p. xviii.

<sup>2</sup> Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Estienne, Paris, 1582.

a translation of Jacques Yver's *Printemps d'Iver* (1572). This passage from Garnier seems to have been deliberately lifted for insertion in *Soliman and Perseda*.

MARION GRUBB

Tennessee College

---

### HOTSPUR'S EARTHQUAKE

So far, Shakespearian commentators have traced Hotspur's theory of the cause of earthquakes,

oft the teeming earth  
Is with a kind of colic pinch'd and vex'd  
By the imprisoning of the unruly wind  
Within her womb; which for enlargement striving,  
Shakes the old beldam earth and topples down  
Steeple and moss-grown towers,<sup>1</sup>

to such classical sources as Plutarch's *Opinions of Philosophers* and Pliny's *Natural History*.<sup>2</sup> Since both of these writers offer this theory as one among many, one wonders why Shakespeare's imagination should be taken by it rather than by the water theory or some other. The question is probably answered by mediaeval tradition.

Of the many theories offered by Plutarch, Pliny, Livy, Seneca, and other writers of antiquity, the idea of the caged winds is the one that found the readiest acceptance and emphasis in the Middle Ages. The reason for this is difficult to discover unless one is willing to admit that the Virgilian cave of the winds which "magno cum murmure montis, circum claustra fremunt" had something to do with mediaeval emphasis on this theory. Apparently the first mention of this theory occurs in the *De Natura Rerum* of Isidore of Seville who, after a general summary which includes quotations from Sallustius and Lucanus, says, "Terraemotum autem illic assidue fieri, ubi cava terrarum sunt, in quibus venti ingrediuntur, et faciunt terraemotum."<sup>3</sup> The same scientific

<sup>1</sup> *I Henry IV*, III, i, 28-33.

<sup>2</sup> R. P. Cowl and A. E. Morgan, *The First Part of Henry IV*, Arden ed., pp. 103-104.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, LXXXIII, 1015.

result is obtained by Bede,<sup>4</sup> Honorius Augustodensis,<sup>5</sup> and Alexander Neckham.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps more important for the general knowledge of Shakespeare's time was the emphasis given to this theory by Caxton's translation of the popular French encyclopaedia, the *Image du Monde*, which devotes a whole chapter to the discussion of this idea.<sup>7</sup> It will be seen that in the strict sense the theory of Hotspur is mediaeval in emphasis rather than classical.

Whether or not Shakespeare subscribed to this theory is difficult to say; however, a reference in *As You Like It*<sup>8</sup> to the ability of earthquakes to move mountains suggests that Shakespeare may have been *au courant* with the more advanced discussions of his age. Although this power of the earthquake is overlooked by the mediaeval authorities, it is mentioned by Cardanus in his classification of earthquakes—it is Brasmatichus “cum attolitur: sic fiunt montes, et in mari insulae nascuntur.”<sup>9</sup> A further emphasis of this idea is to be found in *Troilus and Cressida* where Ulysses suggests that earthquakes are caused by errant planets<sup>10</sup>—an idea that Cardanus indicates obliquely in his account of comets.<sup>11</sup> If Shakespeare was aware of the Renaissance theory as distinguished from that of the Middle Ages, he may have been consciously ironic when he placed the obsolete theory in the speech of the young warrior who was mocking Glendower for his superstitious ideas.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

---

<sup>4</sup> “De Natura Rerum,” Migne, *op. cit.*, xc, 275-276.

<sup>5</sup> “De Imagine Mundi,” Migne, *op. cit.*, clxxii, 134.

<sup>6</sup> *De Naturis Rerum* (Wright ed., 1863), II, 48.

<sup>7</sup> *Mirroure of the World* (Prior ed., *EETS*, e. s. cx, 1913), pp. 114-115.

<sup>8</sup> III, ii, 196.

<sup>9</sup> “De rerum varietate,” *Opera* (1663), I, 16. The other three types are: Chasmatibus which opens cracks in the earth, Clitimachus which overturns buildings, and Micematichus which produces a great noise. Cf. also, “De Subtilitate Rerum,” *op. cit.*, I, 402: “Ex terrae motibus montes quandoque fiunt.”

<sup>10</sup> I, iii, 97.

<sup>11</sup> “De rerum varietate,” *op. cit.*, I, 2.

THE PRINTER'S COPY FOR *THE CITY-MADAM*

In his admirable edition of Massinger's comedy *The City-Madam* (Princeton University Press, 1934, p. 7) Dr. R. Kirk refers to a note (*RES.*, VII, 206)<sup>1</sup> in which I said that "The quarto of *The City-Madam* was printed from a manuscript . . . which was most likely in Massinger's autograph," and very justly resents my expressing such an opinion without adducing a scrap of evidence in support of it.

For the purpose of that note it did not much matter what sort of manuscript the printer used, and for that reason I did not want to enter on an elaborate discussion of the rather tenuous evidence. I ought not to have raised the question at all; but since I did so, and since Dr. Kirk has expressed the hope that I "or some other authority on seventeenth-century hand-writing will clear up the issue," I blushingly acknowledge the quite unmerited compliment and proceed to say my piece.

The printer of the Quarto (now identified beyond question by Dr. Kirk as being Jane Bell) has rigorously modernized the spelling according to her own rather eccentric standards (for example omitting the final "e" in such words as "knowledg" and "leav"); there is therefore not much hope of tracing in the printed text many spellings characteristic of Massinger's autograph. On the other hand this very fact increases the evidential value of any personal spellings that do survive, and there are a few of them. Professor C. J. Sisson observed in the introduction to his Malone Society edition of *Beleue as you List* (p. xiv) that Massinger "takes thought concerning the spelling of . . . *perfe(ct)*, which he changes to *perfit*" and "invariably inserts a *c* in such words as *thancke*, *sincke*, &c." In *The City-Madam* we find "*perfit* (v, iii, 5 & 8), "*sinck*" (III, ii, 124), and "*truncks*" (IV, iv, 139). None of these spellings is in the least peculiar to Massinger, but it has some slight significance that where the orthography of the Quarto does depart from the printer's rule it spells in a way which an impartial observer has noted as being characteristic of Massinger.

<sup>1</sup> He also cites an article in *The Library* (XI, 78) where I spoke even more confidently, and for this I have no defence to offer—except that I was misquoting myself.

To my own mind there is more weighty evidence in two mistakes which the printer made in setting up the type and corrected whilst the sheets of the Quarto were passing through the press, "caducevs" (in Roman) corrected to "*Caduceus*" (in italics, III, ii, 169) and "Hymas" corrected to "him as" (I, iii, 131). Sisson noted that in Massinger's hand "A *v* is very frequently used medially, as in *ever*, *exeunt*, *trivmph*," and I would add that it is often very difficult to tell whether he intended a small "c" or a capital "C"; these characteristics of his hand would account for "caducevs." Again, Sisson notes "hym" amongst the "invariable" forms which words take in *Beleeue as you List*, and no one could read that play either in Sisson's printed transcript or in Farmer's photographic facsimile without noticing Massinger's partiality for meaningless capital "H"s—there is one in the second line of the play and another in the first line of the second speech. This would account for "Hymas" (which a printer might well take for a classical name on the analogy of Hymen or Hylas).

I should not have claimed to have anything amounting to *proof* that the printer's copy for *The City-Madam* was in the author's own handwriting, but when the few departures from a later norm of spelling are in accord with his practice, and when two of the printer's few known errors are ones to which his tricks of writing might well give rise, I think that there are at any rate some grounds for a surmise that the manuscript "was most likely in Massinger's autograph."

A. K. McILWRAITH

*University of Liverpool*

---

#### DESPORTES AND ARIOSTO: ADDITIONAL SOURCES IN THE *ORLANDO* AND THE *LIRICHE*

Everyone knows that Desportes was a liberal, not to say slavish, imitator of the Italians. The *Rencontres des Muses de France et d'Italie* (Lyon, Jacques Roussin, 1604), and the researches of MM. Flamini and Vianey,<sup>1</sup> with a few additions by Dr. Kastner,<sup>2</sup> have

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Francesco Flamini, *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera*, Livorno, Giusti, 1895, pp. 341-381 and 433-439; and Joseph Vianey, "Une Rencontre des Muses de France et d'Italie demeurée inédite," *RHL*,

shown how much he took. The imitations amount in all to about a hundred. Their substance comes from the various sixteenth-century collections of *Rime scelte*, from the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch, and from the *Orlando Furioso*. It has generally been held that these *rapprochements* represent almost the sum total of Desportes' debt to Italy; that most of the gleaning of sources has been done, and that his other poems must be largely, if not entirely, original.

How thoroughly his other sources have been explored I can not decide; but regarding his borrowings from Ariosto something still remains to be said. In 1828 Saint-Beuve had remarked that the elegy *Contre une nuit trop claire* (*Diverses Amours*) was a translation of the *capitolo* "O nei miei danni più che'l giorno chiara";<sup>3</sup> and M. Vianey mentions two pieces in the *Amours d'Hippolyte* and one in the *Elégies* which show the influence of the *Orlando*;<sup>4</sup> but no one seems to have noticed that Sonnet LII of the *Amours d'Hippolyte*,<sup>5</sup> "Bien que le mal d'Amour, qui me rend furieux," is an adaptation of Ariosto's sonnet, "Ben che'l martir,"<sup>6</sup> or that a *Plainte*, "Quand je pense aux plaisirs qu'on reçoit en aimant," in the *Amours de Diane*, I (p. 60), is simply a rearrangement of his *capitolo* "Chi pensa quanto," with four lines to the stanza instead of three. The chief difference between complaint and *capitolo* lies in the fact that Ariosto concludes pessimistically that it is better to stay out of love than to suffer its pangs and disappointments, while Desportes, with characteristic suavity, declares that the lover's life, and that of the untamed bachelor, have equal charms.

In arranging material taken from the *Orlando*, he is usually

1906, pp. 92-100, and *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Montpellier, Coulet, 1909, chapter on Desportes.

<sup>3</sup> L. E. Kastner, "Desportes et Angelo di Costanzo," *RHL.*, 1908, pp. 113 sqq., and "Desportes et Guarini," *RHL.*, 1910, pp. 124 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> *Tableau*, II, 285.

<sup>5</sup> *Hipp.*, XXV: *O.F.* XLIV, 61; *Hipp.*, *Stances* (p. 176), "Comme on voit . . . Et rien qui soit . . .": *O.F.* XXXVII, 110; *Elégies*, I, 15, from "A l'homme trop avare . . ." to end: *O.F.* XLV, 34-39; cf. *Le Pétrarquisme en France*, *cap. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> *Œuvres de Philippe Desportes*, ed. by Alfred Michiels, Paris, Delahays, 1858; p. 152.

<sup>7</sup> *Lirica di Ludovico Ariosto*, ed. by Giuseppe Fatini, *Scrittori d'Italia*, Vol. 95, Bari, Laterza, 1924.

unable to resist that passion for explanation, definition and over-clarification which is one of his chief defects, and with which his critics have so frequently charged him.<sup>7</sup> Thus in converting into a sonnet some lines from one of Bradamante's laments on the absence of her lover, he manages to quench the spirit of the fiery stanza in a thin drizzle of repetitions:

O grand démon volant, arrête la meurtrière  
 Qui fuit devant mes pas, car pour moy je ne puis;  
 Ma course est trop tardive, et plus je la poursuis,  
 Et plus elle s'avance, en me laissant derrière.  
 Ou fay que son vouloir s'accorde à ma prière,  
 Ou ne me laisse plus en l'estat que je suis;  
 Rends moy comme j'estois, sans dame et sans ennuis,  
 Et delivre ma vie, en ses yeux prisonnière.  
 Si tu es juste, Amour, tu me dois délier,  
 Ou par un doux effort ceste dure plier;  
 Mais, las! que mon attente est folle et misérable!  
 J'importune un tyran, qui de nos maux se plaist,  
 Qui s'abreuve de pleurs, qui d'ennuis se repaist,  
 Et plus il est prié, moins il est pitoyable.

(*Diane*, I, Son. vi; p. 15)

Deh ferma, Amor, costui che così sciolto  
 Dinanzi al lento mio correr s'affretta;  
 O tornami nel grado onde m'hai tolto,  
 Quando nè a te nè ad altri era suggetta!  
 Deh, come è il mio sperar fallace e stolto,  
 Ch'in te con prieghi mai pietà si metta;  
 Che ti diletta, anzi ti pasci e vivi  
 Di trar dagli occhi lacrimosi rivi!

(*O.F.* xxxii, 20)

Desportes, like his predecessors of the Pléiade, shows a decided preference for Bradamante. It is from her speeches and meditations on the cruelty of her neglectful fiancé that he has taken the comparisons of a place once inhabited with the loved one, and later revisited alone, with a garden seen in summer, then in winter (*Complainte*, stanzas 6 and 7, *Diane*, I, p. 47; *O.F.* xlv, 26); and of the creeping doubts and fears that assail him in his sweetheart's absence with the shadows that lengthen as the evening sun declines (*Plainte*, stanza 10, *Diane*, II, p. 70; *O.F.* xlv, 36). From the same source comes his eulogy of constancy, that virtue

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France*, pp. 241-243; and Flamini, *op. cit.*, pp. 350-352.



without which all the others are dimmed, as colors vanish in the absence of light (*Elegie* I, "Mais que ne faites-vous . . . Tout objet . . .," *Elégies*, I, p. 261; *O.F.* xxxii, 38-39). Moreover, his description of the attempted suicide of a certain "desolé Philandre," whose mistress has revealed herself as an "Alcine rusée," is inspired by a similar scene enacted by Bradamante. Like her, Philandre seizes a sword, exclaiming that his only regret is not to have died while in his lady's good graces, and is about to pierce his breast, when a good spirit arrests his right hand and whispers in his heart that it would be some consolation to avenge himself before he dies (*Elégie* XIX, "Mais, voyant que la mort . . . Mets fin à ton amour . . .," *Elégies*, I, 283-284; *O.F.* xxxii, 43-46).

Instead, however, of putting his plans immediately into execution, as had Bradamante, Philandre launches into a comprehensive vituperation of all womankind; this is taken from another part of the *Orlando*, King Rodomonte's furious monologue when he learns that he has been jilted by the Princess Doralice ("O féminin cerveau . . . Et des pauvres humains . . .," pp. 285-286; *O.F.* xxvii, 117-121).

It did not trouble Desportes that others might have used a source before him. The famous stanzas in which Ariosto warns women against the inconstant lover, who spares neither prayers, tears, nor promises until his object is attained, and who resembles a hunter, tracking a hare up-hill and down-dale, through good weather and bad, only to toss the beast aside when he has caught it, and go on in a new pursuit (*O.F.* x, 5-7), had already inspired Baïf and Jamyn. Nevertheless, Desportes likes the passage well enough to make use of it twice, once when telling the story of a lady who was seduced by someone much above her in rank (*Elégie* ix, "Et les grands . . . Et leur amitié . . .," *Elégies*, I, p. 258), and again in a *Chanson*, where he likens Death to the hunter who pursues only what flies (Stanza 7, *Hippolyte*, p. 135).

Less important, but not without interest, is the appearance, in a poem called *De la Jalousie*, of certain details taken from the thirty-first canto of the *Orlando*. Ariosto had said that any other difficulty in the lover's path, enforced absence, rebuffs, caprices, or ill-temper, only serves to make his reward the sweeter when at last it comes; but to a mind poisoned by suspicion, favors and

carresses give more pain than joy; this Desportes repeats (*op. cit.*, Stanzas 7-8, *Diane*, II, p. 90; *O.F.* xxxi, 3-4).<sup>8</sup>

Desportes imitated Ariosto, proportionately, much less frequently than he imitated Sasso, Tebaldeo, Costanzo and other rhymers of elaborate *concetti*. This is evident from the *rapprochements* already made between his work and theirs by MM. Flamini, Vianey, and Kastner. Therefore, since I have been able to discover fresh sources in Ariosto's lyrics and epic, it seems probable that hitherto undetected imitations of his other more favored models could still be brought to light.

It is also possible that the list of authors from whom he borrowed is as yet incomplete, and that new names could be added to it. Desportes is a combiner and adapter, not a creator; he could not, as did Ronsard, completely absorb and ingest in his own spirit the material that he took, or follow the traces of an older author merely as a kind of discipline and direction for his own first steps in a new field. He is heavily dependent on the borrowed elements which he cements together with a few conventional sentiments; and his poems show so little originality, are so lacking in any personal touch, that, except in the case of such pieces as *Eurylas* and *Cleophon* (*Elégies*, II, pp. 307 and 315), where Desportes is narrating events which he witnessed or in which he was a participant, their ancestry is open to doubt.

Further investigations by someone better acquainted with the minor Italian poets of the sixteenth century than I am should prove whether or not this viewpoint is exaggerated, and yield interesting results.

ALICE CAMERON

*Maryland College for Women*

---

<sup>8</sup> M. Mathieu Augé-Chiquet, in an article entitled "D'une 'Canzone' de Corfino à la 'Psychée' de Corneille" (*RHL.*, 1908, pp. 507-510) has shown that besides its containing material taken from Corfino, Tansillo and Anacreon, two lines in the fourth stanza of this poem "En vain . . . Ce mal . . ." come from the above-mentioned canto of the *Orlando*, Stanza 5.

SOBRE LA FECHA DE *FUENTE OVEJUNA*

En la segunda parte de *La Santa Juana*, compuesta por Tirso de Molina a fines de 1613 o a principios del año siguiente,<sup>1</sup> hay un episodio tan parecido a la acción principal de *Fuente Ovejuna*, que hace sospechar la posibilidad de una influencia directa. La semejanza se verá más claramente eliminando las escenas que se refieren a la Santa.

Los aldeanos de Cubas reciben a su comendador, don Jorge de Aragón, con grandes muestras de regocijo. Pero el comendador, que es otro Fernán Gómez, comienza inmediatamente a abusar de su autoridad. Trata despóticamente a sus vasallos, les impone injustos tributos, ultraja a las mujeres, y no reconoce más ley que su capricho. Cansados de sufrir insultos y vejaciones, los aldeanos preparan una rebelión, que no llega a estallar porque el comendador fallece oportunamente.<sup>2</sup> El episodio termina acogiéndose el lugar entero a la autoridad del emperador Carlos V, que lo recibe gustoso bajo su protección.

*Carlos:* A no atajalle la muerte  
vuestras injurias vengara.

*Mingo:* Pues es muerto, gran señor,  
no queremos más venganza  
ni en premio de la lealtad  
que siempre este pueblo guarda,  
sino ser vuestros.

*Carlos:* Yo aceto  
tan fiel y justa demanda.  
No tendréis otro señor.<sup>3</sup>

Como se ve, el argumento de este episodio concuerda en sus puntos fundamentales con el de *Fuente Ovejuna*, y el desenlace es idéntico al que Lope da a su drama. Pero la semejanza de ambas

<sup>1</sup> El autógrafo de la primera parte está firmado en mayo de 1613, y el de la tercera en agosto de 1614.

<sup>2</sup> Y porque a Tirso no le convenía dar demasiada importancia a la acción secundaria en perjuicio de la acción principal.

<sup>3</sup> *Segunda parte de La Santa Juana*, acto III, esc. xx. (Ed. Cotarelo, NBAE., IX, 302.) Comp. *Fuente Ovejuna*, esc. final del acto III: "*Alcalde:* Señor, tuyos ser queremos. / *Rey* nuestro eres natural . . . *Rey:* . . . la villa es bien se quede / en mí, pues de mí se vale." (Ed. Castro, Madrid, Calpe, 1919, págs. 146 y 147.)

obras, aunque la originalidad de Tirso quede a salvo, no se limita al asunto. Intentaré señalar aquí algunas de las coincidencias más sospechosas.

Entre los lugareños que salen a recibir al comendador figuran dos alcaldes y varios músicos que cantan, como en *Fuente Ovejuna*, una canción de bienvenida. El comendador empieza a requebrar a Mari Pascuala, desposada con uno de los alcaldes, precisamente al final de esta escena, lo mismo que en el drama de Lope. Nótese además que Tirso llama a dos de sus personajes Pascuala y Mengo, nombres que aparecen también en *Fuente Ovejuna*.

Los criados del comendador raptan a Mari Pascuala durante la celebración de un bautizo, y Fernán Gómez, con sus criados, interrumpe una boda para llevarse a Laurencia. El paralelismo de ambas situaciones es evidente. Después, cuando los labradores se amotinan dispuestos a no consentir el ultraje, hay uno que se echa atrás por cobardía.

*Crespo:* ¿Eso consentís, cobardes?  
¡Matalde!

*Mingo:* Mátele Dios  
que le hizo.

*Crespo:* ¿Tal injuria  
consentís? ¿Tan gran traición?

*Mingo:* A quien le duele la muela  
que se la saque; andad vos,  
si os atrevéis sin tenazas,  
y sacalde ese raigón.<sup>4</sup>

Obsérvese el carácter cómico de esta escena, que sirve para terminar un acto, y compárese con esta otra de Lope, colocada también al final del acto correspondiente.

*Barrildo:* ¿No hay aquí un hombre que hable?

*Mengo:* Yo tengo ya mis azotes,  
que aun se ven los cardenales  
sin que un hombre vaya a Roma.  
Prueben otros a enojarle.

*Juan Rojo:* Hablemos todos.

*Mengo:* Señores,  
aquí todo el mundo calle.  
Como ruedas de salmón  
me puso los atabales.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *S. J.*, acto I, esc. xxii.

<sup>5</sup> *F. O.*, acto II, p. 98 de la ed. citada.

La escena en que los labradores exponen sus quejas al comendador se parece mucho también a otra de *Fuente Ovejuna*. Cuando don Jorge pregunta si es justo que los vasallos se opongan a su señor, Mingo responde:

Si afrentallos  
quiere su travieso gusto,  
¿qué mucho que se defienda  
quien ve que ese honor se pierde?<sup>6</sup>

Y luego, ante las amenazas del comendador, uno de los villanos le recuerda que hay otra autoridad superior a la suya:

Mira que al Emperador  
ofendes, y cuando venga  
y destos agravios tenga  
noticia, ha de hacer, señor,  
el castigo que tú sabes,  
de su justicia y enojo.<sup>7</sup>

Fácil sería encontrar otras equivalencias en las conversaciones que Lillo—el Flores de *Fuente Ovejuna*—tiene con su amo acerca de las mujeres, y en las orgullosas palabras que don Jorge dirige a sus vasallos,<sup>8</sup> pero bastan las apuntadas para demostrar que Tirso había visto o leído la comedia de Lope antes de ponerse a escribir la suya.

Si esto es verdad, y para mí lo es indudablemente,<sup>9</sup> Lope tuvo que componer *Fuente Ovejuna* en 1613 o poco antes. Lo único que hasta ahora sabemos con certeza sobre la fecha de esta comedia es que su título está incluido en la segunda lista de *El Peregrino* (1618), pero no en la primera (1604). Claude E. Anibal<sup>10</sup> supone

<sup>6</sup> Comp. *F. O.*, p. 96: "No es mucho que en casos tales / se descomponga con vos / un hombre, en efecto, amante; / porque si vos pretendéis / su propia mujer quitarle / ¿qué mucho que se defienda?"

<sup>7</sup> Comp. *F. O.*, p. 96: "Y esto baste; / que reyes hay en Castilla, / que nuevas órdenes hacen, / con que desórdenes quitan. / Y harán mal, cuando descansen / de las guerras, en sufrir / en sus villas y lugares / a hombres tan poderosos / por traer cruces tan grandes."

<sup>8</sup> Por ejemplo: "—¿Y mi honra?—¿Qué más honra / que amarla el comendador?" (*S. J.*, acto I, esc. xxi.) Comp. *F. O.*, acto II, p. 61: "De cualquier suerte que sea / vuestras mujeres se honran."

<sup>9</sup> No he podido hallar en *La Santa Juana* ningún pasaje copiado literalmente, pero esto no significa nada, porque Tirso era demasiado poeta para hacer una imitación servil.

<sup>10</sup> "The historical elements of Lope de Vega's *Fuente Ovejuna*," reprinted from *PMLA.*, Sept. 1934, p. 667.

que fué escrita por los años de 1615 a 1618, basándose en los puntos de contacto que ofrece con otras comedias de esa época, y sobre todo en ciertas alusiones genealógicas. Esta bien fundada conjetura no destruye mi hipótesis, pues al fin la diferencia no pasa de dos o tres años, pero hace inverosímil que la comedia en cuestión se escribiera mucho antes. Por consiguiente, mientras no se demuestre lo contrario, creo que la fecha de *Fuente Ovejuna* debe fijarse hacia 1613, si no en ese mismo año.

J. ROBLES PAZOS

### THE MOST DIFFICULT PASSAGE OF *DON QUIJOTE*

We are in the sixth chapter. They are about to burn Don Quijote's books! The priest and the barber are standing in judgment over the *Historia del famoso caballero Tirante el Blanco*, the former remarks that for its style it is the best book in the world, and adds, "Nevertheless, I tell you that he who composed it deserved to be thrown into the galleys for all the days of his life, for did he not produce all that nonsense intentionally?" The Spanish, which I quote from the critical edition of A. Hämel, reads as follows.

Con todo eso, os digo que merecía el que lo compuso (¿pues no hizo tantas necesidades de industria?) que le echaran a galeras por todos los días de su vida.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Hämel adds the modest note, *ich möchte die Leseart der Originale beibehalten und obige Interpunktion vorschlagen*.

When it first appeared in print the passage looked like this:

Con todo esso os digo, que merecia el que le compuso, pues no hizo tantas necesidades de industria, que le echaran a galeras, por todos los dias de su vida: Lleuadle a casa, etc.

This has been called "the most difficult passage in *Don Quijote*." It is probably no more than a case of inadequate punctuation, that is, inadequate judging by present day standards. Is this an isolated case? To find support for Professor Hämel's reading I have examined all the passages in *Don Quijote* now pointed as exclamations, and all pointed as questions, and have collated them with the

<sup>1</sup> *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Kritische Ausgabe mit Kommentar in 5 Bänden, besorgt von Adalbert Hämel, Halle (Saale), 1925, Band I, 53, 3-6.

original readings, using for this purpose facsimiles made by The Hispanic Society of America from Cuesta's first edition of the *Primera Parte* (Madrid, 1605) and from his first edition of the *Segunda Parte* (Madrid, 1615), and the modern edition of F. Rodríguez Marín in the *Clásicos Castellanos* (8 vols., Madrid, 1911-1913).

The phrase that has caused so much trouble is an exclamatory, or rhetorical, question, not meant to elicit information but to emphasize a point. Such may nowadays be enclosed between exclamation points. That the first printer would not have used the point we infer from the fact that the sign (!) occurs only three times in the first edition of 1605 and only three times in the first edition of the *Segunda Parte*. Four more passages (these in the *Segunda Parte*) are set off with an inverted small letter *i*, perhaps indicating a scarcity of the required sign in the printer's cases. In the first of these the inverted *i* is not separated from the foregoing word by the usual space between words. There are then in the original *Don Quijote* only ten passages punctuated as exclamations, all much longer and more emphatic than the one we are studying. These I have copied in Appendix I below. Is it not possible that the first readers (including the proof reader, if any) would have read the passage as exclamatory without sensing a difficulty, or feeling any need of other punctuation? The passage may be one of hundreds of others originally without an exclamation point.

As to the probability of a missing question mark, that too is great. In all of *Don Quijote* there are 234 passages that now carry question marks but were without them when they first appeared in print. Seventy-two of these are in the *Primera Parte*. In only about ten of these does the question seek for definite information, so that the absence of the point may be attributed to carelessness. The rest may be regarded as more or less exclamatory and their punctuation justified as in accord with the printer's system. The accuracy of this inference may be checked by examining the references I have given in Appendix II. In either case, carelessness or system, Professor Hämel's reading is strongly supported.

Space is lacking for examples from the different groups into which the unpunctuated questions of the original fall. Most numerous are exclamatory questions either affirmative or negatives; then, as a subdivision well represented, there are questions preceded or fol-

lowed by an exclamation; there are questions followed by an imperative, an imprecation, or a reason for asking; there are questions in which part of the interlocutor's question or statement is taken up (*e. g.*, What are we to do?—What?—said he); there is the type of rejecting question (*e. g.*, *Cómo ha de ser?*); and the what-do-you-mean-by type. All these are more or less exclamatory.

Our passage does not stand entirely alone in having missed the dress of modern punctuation. Rodríguez Marín says of the following one that *Clemencín y Cortejón omitieron indebidamente los signos admirativos*:

—Pues ¡es verdad—replicó don Quijote—que no acompaña esa grandeza y la adorna con mil millones de gracias del alma! III 134, 15-17, I, XXI.

The first edition has:

Pues es verdad, replicó don Quijote, que no acompaña essa grandeza, y la adorna con mil millones, y (*sic*) gracias del alma. 172 verso, 23-26.

To show how embarrassing to the present day reader the scanty punctuation of the original may be, I transcribe three passages from the original each followed by the same in modern dress:

Miente delante de mi, ruyn villano, dixo don Quixote: Por el sol. . . . 12v2-3.

“¡Miente” delante de mí, ruin villano?—dijo don Quijote.—Por el sol. . . . I 116, 5-6, I, LV.

Yrme yo con el, dixo el muchacho, mas mal año, no señor, ni por pienso: 12v28-29.

—¡Irme yo con él—dijo el muchacho—más? ¡Mal año! No, señor, ni por pienso; I 118, 16-17, I, IV.

Pero açotarme yo abernuncio. 137v27.

. . . pero ¿azotarme yo . . .? Abernuncio. VI 239, 25, II, XXXV.

#### APPENDIX I

All the passages containing an exclamation point in the first edition of *Don Quijote*.

Valame Dios, y quien será aquel que buenamente pueda contar aora, la rabia que entró en el coraçon de nuestro Manchego, viendose parar de aquella manera! Pt. I, Chap. IX, *folio 33 verso*, line 30—*folio 34 recto*, line 2.

O flor de la caualleria, que con solo vn garrotazo acabaste la carrera de tus tan bien gastados años! I, LII, 311v29-31.

O liberal sobre todos los Alexandros, pues por solos ocho meses de seruicio me tenias dada la mejor insula que el mar ciñe, y rodea! I, II, 312r3-5.



Santa Maria, y valme, este no es Tomé Cecial mi vezino, y mi compadre; II, XIII, 52r16-17.

Como, y es possible, que ay oy Caualleros Andantes en el mundo? y que ay historias impresas de verdaderas Cauallerias; II, XVI, 56r25-27.

a fuerza de la adulacion a quanto te estiendes, y quan dilatados limites son de tu jurisdiccion agradable; II, XVIII, 68r25-27.

A bodas de Camacho, y abundancia de la casa de don Diego, y quantas vezes os tengo de echar menos; II, XXIII, 93r5-7.

Crueldad notoria, dixo Sancho, dessagradecimiento inaudito: yo de mí sé dezir, que me rindiera, y me auassallara la mas minima razon amorosa suya, hideputa, y que coraçon de marmol, que entrañas de bronce, y que alma de argamasa! II, LVIII, 221r10-14.

Aquí sí que fue el admirarse de nuevo: aquí sí, que fue el erizarse los cabellos a todos de puro espanto! II, LXII, 240r26-27.

cabeça sabia, cabeça habladora, cabeça respondona, y admirable cabeça! II, LXII, 240r30-31.

## APPENDIX II

References to passages now pointed as questions but without the question mark in the *princeps* edition, followed in each case by parallel references to the edition of Rodríguez Marín enclosed in parentheses:

12v2-3 (I 116, 5-6) 12v28-29 (I 118, 16-17) 14v6-8 (I 126, 13-15) 16r12-16 (I 136, 15-19) 17r5-7 (I 139, 14-140, 2) 19r32-v1 (I 153, 5-6) 21r6-10 (I 162, 4-163, 1) 23v7-8 (I 177, 2-4) 24r3-8 (I 179, 8-13) 25v3-4 (I 187, 11) 29v26-29 (I 206, 4-7) 35r22-25 (I 235, 19-20) 42v6-7 (I 261, 6-10) 47r30-47v9 (I 284, 18-285, 9) 59r31-v1 (II 1, 11-14) 60r1-3 (II 13, 7-9) 60r7-9 (II 13, 14-16) 64r30-32 (II 33, 4-8) 68r18-22 (II 49, 11-50, 4) 69r6-8 (II 52, 16-18) 69r11-13 (II 53, 3-6) 72v28-30 (II 67, 17-18) 75r10-12 (II 77, 22-24) 77v7-9 (II 89, 22-23) 78r3-5 (II 91, 18-20) 78r27-28 (II 93, 18-19) 78v27-28 (II 95, 13) 82r31-v1 (II 110, 6-7) 88r25-26 (II 138, 21) 95r16 ff. (II 168, 20 ff.) 100r20-23 (II 192, 11-14) 104r19-20 (II 215, 12-13) 104r30-31 (II 216, 12) 104v6-10 (II 236, 14-237, 4) 123r16-18 (II 290, 11-14) 123v13-14 (II 291, 22) 125r27-29 (II 301, 11) 130v11-14 (II 318, 14-319, 3) 131r8-9 (II 321, 1) 134v9-14 (II 334, 12-18) 141v3 ff. (II 21, 24 ff.) 144v30-145r1 (III 34, 3-10) 145r26-28 (III 35, 11-14) 149r3-6 (III 46, 4-7) 163r24-25 (III 94, 3-5) 171r2-3 (III 125, 3-4) 171r22-25 (III 217, 9-13) 172v23-26 (III 14-16) 174r23-25 (III 139, 15-140, 2) 175r31-v2 (III 143, 8-10) 176v10-12 (III 147, 15-16) 186r2-5 (III 183, 4-7) 188r31-v1 (III 192, 9-12) 203r9-10 (III 241, 5-8) 203v1-3 (III 242, 13-16) 208v10-13 (III 266, 1-3) 234r4-7 (IV 21, 16-22, 3) 252r19-22 (IV 86, 14-17) 262v13-17 (IV 123, 12-15) 264v6-9 (IV 129, 22-130, 3) 267v20-22 (IV 142, 9-11) 276v7-10 (IV 181, 5-7) 278r30-v3 (IV 187, 10-15) 280v11-16 (IV 196, 9-14) 288v6-10 (IV 212, 13-213, 4) 287v21-25 (IV 222, 9113) 294v30-295r3 (IV 252, 18-24) 300r21-300v4 (IV 275, 6-18) 300v8-32 (IV 276, 4-278, 7) 303r31-303v2 (IV 287, 5-288, 2) 308r9-13 (IV 309, 15-19) 310v11-15 (IV 314, 8-11.)

H. H. ARNOLD

## REVIEWS

---

*The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition.* Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES OSGOOD, FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD.

*The Faerie Queene, Book Two.* EDWIN GREENLAW, Special Editor assisted by RAY HEFFNER, JAMES G. McMANAWAY, ERNEST A. STRATHMANN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. x + 517. \$6.00.

*The Faerie Queene, Book Three.* FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD, Special Editor. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 432. \$6.00.

The second and third volumes of this invaluable work are continued on the lines of the first, reviewed in this periodical in April, 1933. If anything the work in the opinion of the present writer gains in interest as it proceeds. The first book has been made the subject of so much study that there was less that was unfamiliar and what there was not always attractive. These books have not been quite so frequently edited in separate volumes, and the notes and dissertations bring together much that, scattered through periodicals or theses, has not always attracted the attention of scholars other than specialists in Spenser.

The plan of the work is now well known and need not be dwelt on at length—the commentary on each successive canto, the various appendixes, and the final textual appendix followed by critical notes on the text, and a bibliography. What was said of the textual appendix in my review of the first book applies to these volumes so far as I have found time to check them. The text is practically identical with that of the Oxford edition. The record of variations in spelling and punctuation is fuller than that in the Oxford edition, and I have noticed but few, and those trifling, omissions. See i. lvi. 9 and lviii. 3 and 4. In the nine instances where a non-rhyming word has by chance been used for the rhyming word of the same meaning by Spenser, the editors have substituted the correct word in place of merely recording it. This was perhaps the right thing to do when the textual material is so far removed from the text itself and a reader cannot correct for himself by a glance at the notes in the foot of the page. In the enumeration of these nine places 2. 8. 29. 5. should read 7 for 5.

But the chief interest of this great edition lies in the commentary and the special appendixes. In the Second Book the latter deal with The Date of Composition, Historical Allegory, Moral Alle-

gory, The Virtue of Temperance, Spenser and Milton, the Morality Theme, Sources, Elizabethan Psychology, the structure of the poem, and the recondite twenty-second stanza of canto 9. On not all of these does the present writer feel able or desirous of commenting. What concerns every lover of Spenser's poetry is the right interpretation (so far as they can be interpreted) of the historical and the moral allegory. On the former the most valuable and interesting quotation is that from the late Professor Greenlaw's *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*. Taken in this broad way and without any attempt to solve the cross-word puzzles (to use Greenlaw's own word) of personal identification, etc. the allegory gains a fresh interest even for one who finds allegory in general merely an intrusion in poetry. For thus seen the allegory of the second book is a statement of a cardinal principle in English policy, a fundamental trait in the English character, the love of the *via media*, of compromise, the distrust of "the dead reckoning of logic" being followed to its furthest extreme. It was the realisation of this which made Elizabeth the great Queen that she was. It was the failure to realise it which in the end was fatal both to Charles and Laud on the one hand and to the presbyterians and puritans on the other. The Restoration and the Revolution of 1688 were the affirmation of the same spirit. On the Moral Allegory and the Virtue of Temperance, which are parts of the same question, the best paper seems to me that by Viola Hulbert which modifies the interpretation of Spenser's doctrine of the mean as based on Aristotle by consideration of the mediaeval, Christian tradition. "The figures of Medina, Elissa and Perissa with Sans-loy and Hudibras are not the means and extremes of the Aristotelian temperance. Even if the Aristotelian temperance is made to include the Aristotelian continence it is still too narrow to cover the characteristics of these figures. The meeting of Guyon with Shamefastness gains meaning when one considers that Verecundia is an integral part of temperance in Christian ethics. "... Spenser's virtues are Christian virtues." Thus broadly taken the allegory becomes more vital, not a pedantic poetising of Aristotle after the manner of Stephen Hawes, but a vivid reflection of the spirit, of the Christian spirit, of Spenser's age.

Certainly the allegory is in the Second Book somewhat of a tough nut for the lover of poetry to crack. It is omnipresent and there is no real conflict to heighten the interest as in the First Book. The difficulty of harmonising moral and poetic effect could hardly be made more visible than in the two finest cantos of the poem, the descent of Guyon into the den of Mammon (Canto VII.) and the overthrow of Acrasia's Bower of Bliss in the last Canto (Canto XII.). The first of these has a splendid moral glow about it, but the impression is of a noble knight passing undismayed through threatening perils on every side (such as one might find in Southey's *Curse of Kehama*). There is no suggestion of tempta-

tion, of allurements despite the speeches of Mammon. The atmosphere of the whole is rather that of the descent of Aeneas to the lower world, from which some of the details are borrowed. The poetry here is all on the side of the virtue, the heroic virtue which, not so much tempted as threatened, passes on undismayed. If Mammon really wished to tempt he should surely have kept out of sight the "poor damned wights," Tantalus and Pilate. In the Bower of Bliss it is the other way about. The poetry is on the side of the alluring voices:

Eftsoones they heard a most melodious sound &c.

and the mode in which the lady and her lover are overcome is a little too reminiscent of the discovery in Homer of Mars and Venus, so favourite a subject with the Renaissance painters. Of the more pedantic development of the Allegory I need not say much, the House of Alma etc. I would rather call the reader's attention to Greenlaw's excellent essay on Spenser and Milton. He seems to me always to say the right thing e. g. again: "Archimago in this book is not primarily representative of the Jesuits, or even of Hypocrisy, as is often said; he stands for Satan. The source, I believe, is Tasso, particularly in the attempts made by him to create enmity between Arthur and Guyon . . . and in his employment of a beautiful witch, Duessa, as Tasso's Satan employs Armida. That Spenser has a Satan much like Milton's in mind is indicated by the statement 'For to all good he enemy was still,' and by the fact that he has escaped from confinement and fares forth to work mischief."

The sources are dealt with with all the exhaustiveness which one has come to expect in American work—sometimes perhaps with excessive detail, and not always with the attention needed to the work that was actually available at the time Spenser wrote. Such attention gives worth to Warton's note on Gelli's *Circe* translated in 1557, and to Lotspeich's on Natalis Comes (p. 376) and to the note of Miss Hulbert to which I have referred. In the main the right things are emphasised:—Ariosto, Tasso, the Chronicles and Spenser's interest in British and Tudor history on which Greenlaw had done such good work. In the Appendix on Elizabethan Psychology none of the critics has noticed that mediaeval doctrine of the memory was based ultimately on Aristotle's *περὶ μνήμης καὶ ἀναμνήσεως*. "Anamnestes" is not the "reminder" but rather the "recollector," recollection, what one does for oneself not what is done by another. Perhaps in this connection too much is made by Boughner of the fact that in Spenser's account reason comes between Phantastes (*φαντασία* is, by the way, more than imagination) and Eumnestes, but the suggestion is interesting. Some misprints may be noted: p. 416 where two lines from Harrison have been inverted; p. 423 "gables" for "cables"; 442, where a line has been left out in the stanza quoted; p. 201, where there are

some five small errors in the printing of the Greek, and some similar slips are to be noted at pp. 216, 224, 253, 254, 263; at 374 "siquic" should be "siquis" and at 390 "Idem quem" should be "Idem quom."

If the allegory is rather insistent in the Second Book it is with some relief to the reader, and probably to the poet, that in the third book this schematic treatment gave place to a freer handling, and story becomes a greater interest—story and variety of character. The suggestion of contemporary portraits and allusion to contemporary events is also stronger. Accordingly, in this volume, accompanying the commentary, we have appendixes of interest on the Plan and Conduct of Book Three, the source of Britomart, the Garden of Adonis, the Masque of Cupid, Spenser's debt to the Italian romances and his use of material drawn from this source, Historical Allegory, the Women of the Allegory a subject on which Dowden had written for Grosart what is reproduced here and Spenser's use of the Plastic Arts. The first of these absorbs the treatment of the Moral Allegory. Of this theme the fullest and most detailed discussion is that of Professor Padelford reproduced from his "Allegory of Chastity in the Faerie Queene" (pp. 367-81). No one who has not studied the question with the care of the author has the right to criticise this detailed argument. But to the present writer it does seem that the allegory thus abstractly analysed does not add to the interest of the poem, which is perhaps Spenser's fault not the critic's. Here again the broader treatment, represented by what De Selincourt has to say, is more conducive to a right appreciation of the poem on its spiritual side. It must always be remembered that an allegory of Chastity is an allegory of Love. True love and chastity for Spenser and Milton are inseparable, and accordingly Spenser's story becomes a consideration of the varied aspects of love and womanhood, and so it also falls into the stream of the mediaeval allegory represented preeminently by the Romance of the Rose. Not so much different types of women as different aspects of her character and charm are represented by Florimell and Amoret and Belphebe and the more all-inclusive Britomart. And one of the other chief interests of this Book and the next is the width of Spenser's view, more wide and vivid than always self-consistent. Thus a whole Appendix has been rightly given to the Garden of Adonis canto. For this it has always seemed to the present writer is the evidence that Spenser could see that love, however it behooves men to moralise and restrict it, is in itself a great, amoral, natural force. Professor Osgood has shown Spenser's debt to Lucretius but Spenser is not a Lucretian nor indeed any specific type of philosopher. He blends, as Saurat has pointed out in an article here summarised and cited, inconsistent ideas in a lyrical, sensuous description of Nature's procreative power free from all the inhibitions that he must insist on in the stories of

human love. Another Appendix deals fully with the sources and character of the other chief beauty of this book, the Mask of Cupid, which, as is justly pointed out by Greenlaw, is full of mediaeval elements drawn from the romances and treated, one might add, in the spirit of the Romance of the Rose. This is well supplemented by what Dodge has to show of the debt to the Italian romances.

The story of Amoret is one of the most delightful and at the same time one of the most difficult to interpret allegorically in the poem, for the allegory of love and chastity flows on easily, as the next book will show, into the allegory of friendship. Mr. Padelford's interpretation may be sound. If so it brings into sharp relief the opposition between the poetry of Spenser's romance and the prose of its allegoric interpretation. Is it conceivable that the beautiful verse with which the book originally ended:

Lightly he clipt her twixt her armes twaine &c.

describes the feelings with which Sir Scudamour welcomes the escape of his wife from all admixture of passion in her love for him? But it is hardly just to ask for too close a parallel between the story and its moral significance. Still the present writer has always felt that the story of Amoret, a more real person than Belpheobe who is simply a compliment to Elizabeth (if one may believe Ben Jonson, not too well deserved), is meant to suggest, not some inward imperfection of her life and character, but the solicitations and persecution to which one living the life of the Court was likely to be subjected: "I doubt," says Montaigne, "if the achievements of an Alexander or a Caesar surpass in difficulty the steadfastness of a handsome young woman, brought up after our fashion, in the open view and in contact with the world, assailed by so many contrary examples, keeping herself entire in the midst of a thousand powerful and persistent solicitations. . . And the vow of chastity is the most noble of all vows, as being the hardest." She is exposed, even after marriage, to the same temptations and trials as the maiden in Comus resists. Amoret has also resisted but it is with the aid of the more masculine Britomart that she is delivered. I may be wrong, but Mr. Padelford's interpretation does rather rob the story of its poetry. But indeed the difficulty of this kind of abstract allegory is only too fully illustrated by Spenser's pictures of the vices which are the opposite of the virtue he is extolling. Only a moralist could have told in such detail the story of Malbecco. In Florimel and the false Florimel we have the contrast which Spenser stresses in the Hymns between the beauty which is the index of beauty of character and that which is an illusion; in Amoret the perfect wife able to resist all solicitation if lacking the courage to repel all advances and deliver herself from her persecutors. "A gallant man" says Montaigne, "does not give up his pursuit for a refusal, provided it be a refusal of chastity not of choice. Though we swear and threaten and complain ever so much, we lie; we love

them the better for it. There is no greater allurements than a chastity that is not hard and forbidding." Britomart in whom all the virtues of other types are combined could not only resist but be, when needed, "forbidding."

It is difficult in a short review to do justice to all the wealth of material which the editors have brought together in these admirable volumes which, with all they contain, are yet so light to hold, so pleasant to use, as the edition of so delightful a poet should be. Two concluding remarks may be allowed, one is the sense of respect inspired by the notes of Upton who added to Jortin's classical knowledge an acquaintance also with the Italian romances. The other is one of profound regret that Greenlaw was not spared to complete his work on the Second Book.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

*Edinburgh*

---

*The Axiochus of Plato Translated by Edmund Spenser.* Edited by FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. ix + 80. \$2.75.

If Fate had allowed us to call one of Spenser's lost works from the vasty deep, probably most of us would not have chosen his translation of the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus*. However, any addition to the canon is welcome, and this work has considerable interest for the Spenserian student. It appears in an attractive volume, and Professor Padelford has spared no pains in furnishing a full and scholarly apparatus. Any account of the work must of necessity be a summary of his introduction. The story of its re-discovery, while not one of the romances of bibliography, is enough to set the fancy roaming, and one may recall J. C. (or must one say Sir John?) Squire's tale of the auction-room browser who found the *Hamlet* manuscript in the diary of Anne Hathaway! Although mentioned by eighteenth-century scholars, the *Axiochus* had disappeared by 1805, when Todd issued his edition of Spenser. In 1931 Professor Padelford acquired from Heffers a copy of the Spenser folio of 1679 which included a quarto edition of the *Axiochus*, printed by Cuthbert Burbie in 1592. The volume had come from a Shropshire library, but its history is unknown.

Professor Padelford thinks, for several good reasons, that the translation was an early work, done probably before *The Shepheardes Calender*, at any rate before Spenser left England in 1580. While this dialogue was very popular in sixteenth-century Europe, Spenser may have been led to it through Philippe de Mornay and Sidney; Mornay's French version was published in 1581, and he may have been at work on it while he was in England in 1577-78. However, Spenser's translation shows no indebtedness to Mornay's.

The editor has been able to prove "beyond any question" that Spenser used the Greek-Latin text of Rayanus Welsdalius (1568), "and that he relied upon the Latin rather than the Greek. This does not necessarily mean that he ignored the Greek which appeared in parallel columns, but there is not a single phrase or word in which he followed the original at the expense of the Latin." This is another bit of evidence against the notion that Spenser had any great knowledge of Greek. Professor Padelford adds much to the value of the book by reprinting the Greek and Latin texts.

Like most Elizabethans, Spenser seldom contents himself with one word when he can use two or three, and, like most writers of the sixties and seventies, he has a strain of Euphuism. But the translation is fluent, graceful, and sometimes eloquent, and even though not an original work it seems to reflect something of Spenser's mingled idealism and melancholy. Professor Padelford points out a number of parallels between its phrases and Spenser's verse, and it is of interest to see that many of the ideas, however commonplace, were among those that remained close to his heart. The translation may take a modest place among the rich meditations on mutability and death which were to multiply in the seventeenth century.

DOUGLAS BUSH

*University of Minnesota*

---

*Edmund Spenser: A Critical Study.* By B. E. C. DAVIS. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. ix + 267. \$3.00.

Mr. Davis has given us a very readable book and at times a stimulating one. Spenser is here considered, to quote from the preface (pp. vii-viii),

first as the new poet of that English Renaissance which sprang from the union of classical and medieval culture, secondly as the Poet's Poet, prescribing by example to his successors a grammar of poetry that has stood the test of time. [Mr. Davis continues:] If, as I believe, Spenser deserves recognition not merely as a weaver of fine phrases and fantasies but as a thinker and interpreter of his age, this was because the New Poet was also the Poet's Poet, or, in other words, through the creative influence of Humanism upon an individual poetic genius.

Here then is an answer to those critics who see in Spenser only a series of pretty pictures and those who characterize his philosophy, aside from his "borrowed platonism," as "trite, tame, shallow, nerveless." Of course, Spenser cannot be counted as one of "the philosophers"; his ideas were borrowed, as were the ideas of all his contemporaries. But he does mirror the thought of his age in all its



diversity. Mr. Davis insists, and I think rightly, on the influence of Lucretius and Ovid as well as of Plato and Aristotle, of the "Atheistic" school of Raleigh and the Kabbala as well as of the Bible and Protestant theology. His was a restless and inquiring mind, if not an inventive one, ever exploring the writings and thoughts of others, even of the detested Irish bards. Because he did not accept wholeheartedly the scepticism of Lucretius is no indication that he did not read Lucretius and was not profoundly stirred by his reading. That he could have found most of the ideas in his Garden of Adonis passage in Ovid has been pointed out long ago, but there is nothing in Ovid, or in Golding's translation, to stimulate Spenser and to invoke that profound questioning which is evident in the "Cantos of Mutabilitie." To question Spenser's knowledge of Lucretius seems to me absurd in the extreme; he must have *known* Lucretius. (See his translation of Lucretius, i, 1-23 in *F. Q.* iv, x, 44-7.) If he knew him, why is it considered necessary to deny him use of the ideas he found there? Although Mr. Davis does not discuss the recent attacks on the late Professor Greenlaw's theory of Lucretian influence, his final chapter, and indeed most of his book is an effective answer to those critics who cannot find it in their hearts to believe that gentle Spenser was ever tainted by the sceptical ideas of that "aetheistical Machieval," Lucretius. Spenser, and Mr. Davis insists (p. 211), was "a serious thinker striving earnestly through reading and observation to formulate a criticism of life." To his contemporaries he was the "learned poet," and to Milton, the "sage and serious Spenser."

The chapters on "Humanism," "Romance," and "Allegory" (III-V) present the many-sidedness of Spenser. They have for their theme the fusing of old story and symbolism with the spirit of the Elizabethan age and the making of a new epic of Humanism. There is nothing new in these chapters, but they are well written and make stimulating reading. Mr. Davis is unacquainted with the more recent views on Spenser's political and historical allegory; he neglects altogether, for example, the work of C. Bowie Millican and the late Professor Greenlaw on the Arthurian background of the *Faerie Queene*. His statement (p. 106) that the political allegory is "only surface deep" is the result of his failure to read these two recent studies. As a result, he fails to differentiate between the broad political intention, as Professor Greenlaw explains it in his *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*, and the minute matching of patterns of the crossword-puzzle school. There is a real distinction between topical allusion and Spenser's evident intention to celebrate Elizabeth in a truly national epic, to set forth allegorically the greatness of her reign and the high destiny of her people. It was that allegory, of which the philosophical or moral allegory was a part, which was Spenser's primary concern. To neglect the political allegory, then, is to neglect Spenser's very purpose in writing his epic.

A student of Spenser will find little that is new to him in the chapters on "Diction," "Imagery," "Verbal Music, Verse" (VI-VIII), but his appreciation will be heightened by Mr. Davis' analysis.

As if to forestall some such criticism as that which follows, Mr. Davis says of his chapters on the "Life and Works" (I-II): "I make no claim to have discovered fresh biographical material, and question whether many more particulars of importance are now available." (p. viii.) I cannot accept this excuse. It should be the duty of every writer of even a "biographical sketch" of Spenser at least to check the information which he passes on. Mr. Davis not only fails to give anything new in his "Life," but he perpetuates a great many of the old errors. See, for example, his repetition (p. 31) of the statement that Spenser received a grant of the lands of Kilcolman on June 27, 1586. There is not a shred of evidence to support such a statement; it had its origin in an error in Carpenter's *Reference Guide* and is repeated by Miss Henley and Mr. Davis. A visit to the exhibition room of the Public Record office in London—only a short distance from Cambridge—would have given Mr. Davis the facts. His account of the quarrel with Lord Roche (pp. 49-50) is but one more example of Mr. Davis' failure to get at the facts.

A great deal of new material on Spenser's life awaits the researcher with the time and industry to search it out. At the Public Record office in London, for example, are many unnoticed references to the poet—some of little moment and others of great importance. In fact, any new information concerning a major poet, about whom we know as little as we do about Spenser, is important. The following entries in the Wage Book<sup>1</sup> for Ireland (1584-5) are an example of what can be found if sought.

He [Nicholas Dawtrye, Seneshall of Clandeboy] is further owinge to . . . Edmonde Spencer<sup>2</sup> p bill dated xxij<sup>do</sup> Augustij 1582 signed to Walter Sedgrave . . . xiiij<sup>li</sup> vjs viij<sup>d</sup>.

Edw: Barkley esquier constable of Askeatin . . . He owethe and is indebted viz. . . . to Edmunde Spencer<sup>3</sup> by bill of the firste of february 1584 . . . vij<sup>li</sup>.

Captaine Garrat fitz Garret . . . He oweth and is indebted viz. . . . to . . . Edmunde Spencer<sup>4</sup> p p<sup>st</sup> bill xiiij<sup>do</sup> Sept. 1581 . . . iiij<sup>li</sup> viijs ster fac ir . . . cxvijs iiij<sup>d</sup>.

I cannot show here the importance of these entries, but they may, upon further study and research, cast some light upon Spenser's whereabouts and occupation between 1581 and 1584. The more

<sup>1</sup> SP., 67. 11 (*Irish Folios*, 11, P. R. O.).

<sup>2</sup> Fol. 40r. Dawtrye's name appears on fol. 39v.

<sup>3</sup> Fol. 45v. Entered also in "A Coppye of ye Recknyng of Captaine Edward Barkeley," SP., 63. 117, item 25, p. 361.

<sup>4</sup> Fol. 49v.

details of this nature we unearth the more we know about Spenser. We need very badly a new life of Spenser, but that life must be based on a careful and systematic checking of all documents known to relate to Spenser as well as upon the new material that *can* be found.

The one great fault of this book is that it neglects most of the recent articles on Spenser in the learned journals. This neglect may be deliberate on Mr. Davis' part, or it may be the result of his naïve assumption (p. vii) that "materials . . . within the confines of periodicals" are beyond the pale. Despite these objections, as I have indicated before, there is much to recommend Mr. Davis' book not only to Spenser scholars but also to those who "just don't read Spenser."

RAY HEFFNER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

*Translations from the Classics into English from Caeton to Chapman, 1477-1620.* By HENRY BURROWES LATHROP. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 35.) Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1933. Pp. 350. \$2.00.

No aspect of his complex subject eludes Professor Lathrop. While he attempts no survey of continental editing and translating of the classics, that background gives almost unfailing precision to his study of the English translations. Somewhere on his big canvas he has represented virtually every work and every author to be found in his appendices, which list all the known translations chronologically and the translators alphabetically. Perspective cannot be perfect in a study whose scale permits quotations of more than a page from John Harington "the elder's" dedication of his *De Amicitia* to a dowager Duchess of Suffolk and from Wilson's dedication of his Demosthenes to Cecil. Yet there is no confusion. Professor Lathrop closes his book with a critical bibliography no less discriminating than extensive, and he focuses almost every ray of the light—sometimes clarifying and sometimes distorting—which scholarship has thrown upon both his woods and his trees.

Individual translations—their genesis, their bibliographical problems, and their literary interpretation—are his keenest interest. It is only to indicate broad and obvious differences in the landscape that he divides his field into four periods. He refuses to hypostatize Translation as an organic phenomenon in itself. Significantly, the last four pages of his very long chapter on the third period (1557-1593) systematically refute Professor C. H. Conley's treat-

ment<sup>1</sup> of the gentlemen translators of Elizabeth's youth, most of them members of the Inns of Court, as a company working with the countenance of liberal statesmen in a self-conscious attempt to hoist medieval obscurantism in Church and State with the classical petard. The rebuttal of Professor Conley's strained evidence is complete, but it betrays a certain indifference to the part played by the classics in the philosophical ferment of the time. Less conspicuously the same indifference appears in Professor Lathrop's handling of the classical factor in the "atheism" of Marlowe and Raleigh. In that connection his oversight of Mr. George T. Buckley's *Atheism in the English Renaissance*, which opens with an admirable chapter on "The Classical Sources," is one of his very few bibliographical omissions. This blind spot, however, is venial, for—ethics apart—the philosophical importance of the classics which were translated was secondary. Englishmen, Professor Lathrop believes, took what they craved from the classics, and what they most craved after Elizabeth's accession was food for the adventurous and amatory imagination. His thesis is the familiar one which Professor Walter Schirmer has developed<sup>2</sup> in connection with Shakespeare's decorative and undogmatic use of mythology, but his examination of works like Turberville's *Heroides* and Underdowne's *Ibis* reilluminates the context of Ovid's contribution "to give Shakespeare's writing its peculiar atmosphere of romance." The romantic thesis, however, is not permitted to dominate even the third chapter. Full justice is done to works as diverse as Savile's Tacitus and Billingsley's Euclid, while the entire volume recognizes the perennial influence of William Baldwin's *Moral Philosophy*. By an odd slip, Baldwin, a final allusion to whose work closes the book, is mentioned in both text (p. 74) and index as James, but the name is given correctly in the list of translators and in the reference to W. F. Trench's article, "William Baldwin,"<sup>3</sup> in the bibliography.

Professor Lathrop's greatest general interest is in the relation of the classics and their translation to English prose. Quotations from many a preface display the conscious efforts to approximate English style to divers Greek and Latin originals. Copious extracts illustrate the progress toward the "somewhat Stoic type of rhetoric" of Cheke, Ascham, and Wilson and enable us to understand why "the work of Brende marks a new stadium in the same course . . . ; and Grimald's Cicero sets a new standard of energetic precision and of the effort to deal with fairly refined distinctions in a prose that strives for literary finish." For the analysis of the style of the professional translators of the fourth period (1593-

<sup>1</sup> In *The First English Translators of the Classics*. New Haven, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> In *Antike, Renaissance und Puritanismus*. Second edition, Munich, 1933.

<sup>3</sup> *Mod. Quart. of Lang.*, I, 259.

1620) and of North the allowance of space is almost as generous as it is in Mr. F. O. Matthiessen's much more specialized study of North and Holland.<sup>4</sup> There is little to choose between the two studies of the style of North. Professor Lathrop exhibits just those colloquial and concretely imaginative elements in North's Plutarch for which "Amyot would not quite have approved of his translator." In that style he makes us see the right medium for the "spirit and artistic ideals of Plutarch," which "are those of tragic drama." His handling of individual achievements in style is, perhaps inevitably, more successful than his treatment of the general problem. With characteristic aversion from theories that bring false harmony into the facts Professor Lathrop puts his emphasis upon such incongruities as Adlington's toning down of Apuleius' extravagance and Pettie's "euphuizing" of his much homelier classical material. Anent euphuism, although he recognizes that Lyly's "work is full of borrowings from antiquity, most interestingly from Isocrates," he insists that the peculiar features of that style "are the development not of classical but of medieval methods and ideas." He makes no reference to Pater's discussion in *Marius, the Epicurean* of the essence of which both Apuleius and Lyly were in pursuit. Insistence that "Apuleius was no more and no less a foreigner than other provincials, than Seneca the Spaniard, or Ausonius the Gaul," and "wrote—though in an extreme form—the fashionable style of baroque rhetoric," seems rather to oversimplify the problem of *Africitas*, as the humanists called that baroque style. "M. Norden," as M. Pierre Médan reminds us,<sup>5</sup> "a raillé sans pitié, avec plus de mordant que de finesse, les partisans de l'*Africitas*." For M. Médan "une conception stylistique spéciale à l'Afrique romaine n'est pas niable."<sup>6</sup> For the man who happened to English Apuleius his private variety of *Africitas* had many objections and small charm, but that historical accident cannot have deceived the few sensitive Elizabethans who read him in the original about his prosperous pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp after which they were stumbling with Lyly.

A part of the author's task in this book must inevitably be the correction of many sins of omission and commission. Professor Lathrop's zeal in this matter deserves gratitude; conspicuously his notes on Miss Henrietta Palmer's *List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics Printed before 1641*, his completely documented challenge of Professor W. H. Woodward's assertion in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*<sup>7</sup> that

<sup>4</sup> In *Translation, an Elizabethan Art*.

<sup>5</sup> *La Latinité d'Apulée dans les Métamorphoses*, Paris, 1926, p. 319.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 321.

<sup>7</sup> P. 309. I find Professor Woodward's remark in Vol. III, Chap. xix, p. 482, of the reissue of *The Cambridge History*, not "at the end of chapter four," where Professor Lathrop locates it.

during the period under review "in Greek, not one of the translators, Savile excepted, but works through a French version like North," and his transfer of credit for Shakespeare's cannibals from Raleigh (and Montaigne?) to Pliny. His evidence of Grimald's source for the *Death of Zoroas* and *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes Death* in Beza's poems, which were published in 1548, seems to restore to Surrey the priority in blank verse which Professor Berdan once questioned. Doubtless he will carry most students with him in his attack upon the many too sweeping claims which have been made for Senecan influence upon Elizabethan drama, but he regards one of those claims as more absolute than it is when he quotes Professor Grierson as crediting "Seneca with being the source not only of the formula of Elizabethan drama, but also of the spirit which inspired it; the formula, namely, of crime and the nemesis that overtakes it." Professor Grierson's context in *Cross Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century* deals precisely with those religious and ethical preoccupations of the English mind with which Senecan influence combined. Who can say definitely what was the importance of the Roman reagent in the resulting chemical change?

In his minor corrections Professor Lathrop is not always happy. Miss Foxwell might be absolved for having "spoken hastily" in her edition of Wyatt of *If thou wilt mighty be, flee from the rage* as "entirely founded upon Chaucer," especially since Mr. Tillyard's notes on the poem indicate its Boethian source. The two corrections made of Caxton's translations from the French seem to me unnecessary. *Fardoit sa crueuse face* may be too freely rendered as *clensyd his cruel face*, but I can find no authority for rendering *crueuse* as Professor Lathrop does, to mean *wrinkled*. In such matters the quality of mercy is not strained.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

*University of California*

---

*Surrey's Fourth Boke of Virgill Edited with Introduction, Variant Readings, and Notes.* By HERBERT HARTMAN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. xxviii + 54 + 38 facsimiles. \$4.50.

*Francis Meres's Treatise, "Poetrie," a Critical Edition.* By DON CAMERON ALLEN. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xvi, nos. 3-4. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1933. Pp. 158. \$1.50.

The gratitude of scholars is due to Professor Hartman, the editor, and to Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer, the patron, for their

luxurious edition of the Day-Owen text of Surrey's Fourth Book of Vergil. The work includes a photographic facsimile of the original, a reprint of the text in modern type, with discriminating critical notes, and a concise but informative introduction, dealing skilfully with the somewhat difficult bibliographical problems of the Day-Owen text, giving the evidence that of all extant texts this is the closest to Surrey's own manuscript, characterizing Surrey's meter, and arguing that Surrey owed little if anything to Douglas or Italian translators. Upon this last point the evidence adduced is cogent but not conclusive. The case is not closed by declaring, however truly, that to Surrey Vergil's Latin would have been easier than Douglas's Scots or Liburnio's Italian; for Surrey's problem was not merely to give the sense of his original, but to develop a poetic style energetic, dignified, and graceful—to lay the foundations of English heroic verse. To achieve that end he might well have taken hints from many sources. It still remains for some one with skill and patience to compare Surrey line by line with all possible sources from which he might have drawn suggestions. As one who has readily accepted the scanty evidence of Surrey's debt to Douglas, Piccolomini, and Liburnio, I admit that I expect from such a study full confirmation of Professor Hartman's contention, but the task has still to be completed.

Mr. Allen's edition includes a careful reprint of the section on "Poetrie" from the first edition of Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, and a good account of the bibliography. This introduction demonstrates with the polemic zeal and ruthless thoroughness of a doctor's thesis that Meres, coming at an era of decay in English education, had been demoralized by the practice of *imitatio*, by a system of education which "sanctions a method . . . little better than plagiarism," that he has no ideas of his own, and merely reproduces the comments of other critics, borrowing his comments on classical and neo-classical authors mainly from Ravisius Textor, and on Englishmen from Ascham, Webbe, Nash, Puttenham, and Sidney. The notes cite Meres's sources in detail. I should not have supposed that this exposé was needed to put Meres in his place, for I had the impression that practically all competent scholars regarded him as a dull man mechanically parroting the opinions of others; but when Mr. Allen has done with him he is not merely a plucked chicken, but a wraith. There is another side, however, to the method of *imitatio*. Energetic minds are sometimes stimulated by a generous emulation to equal and even to surpass their models. So it was with some of the classicists, for example, Benjamin Jonson, Milton, Pope, and Samuel Johnson. Burns surpassed but systematically imitated the earlier Scottish song writers. Wordsworth challenged Milton in his sonnets, Tennyson is an abundant imitator, and so is Mr. T. S. Eliot; and all these men are not least original when most imitative. After all, did his imitation

harm Meres? He never would have had anything of his own to say, so that the very unoriginality of his patient collecting makes him the better witness to the judgment of qualified critics in his era.

H. B. LATHROP

*University of Wisconsin*

---

*Art and Artifice in Shakespeare.* By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. Pp. xv + 178. \$2.50.

Professor Stoll's latest addition to his voluminous work on Shakespearean criticism and interpretation has been received with high, not to say enthusiastic, applause abroad. Whether it will add many cubits to his stature as a judge and a master in this country seems open to very considerable doubt. The reason, of course, is that his real service to the understanding of Shakespeare's plays has long been recognized in this country; apparently it is just being discovered abroad.

What that service is can be put very simply: he has insisted for years in lectures, articles, and books that Shakespeare's plays are plays, not transcripts from life, and that the attempt to interpret Shakespeare's characters by the method of modern psychology or to measure them by the standards of modern realism leads inevitably to erroneous conclusions. And his work has been in the main successful. The old romantic school of interpretation which culminated in the work of Bradley is passing from the scene. No Shakespearean scholar today is likely to discuss the youth of Shakespeare's heroines or to inquire into the nature of Hamlet's studies at Wittenberg. Yet in this book Professor Stoll too often seems to play the part of Alexander at Persepolis who

Fought all his battles o'er again;  
And thrice he routed all his foes, and thrice he slew the slain.

Along with this repetition of the old there is a somewhat surprising neglect of the new. No attention is paid for example to Baldwin's important work on the contribution of his player-colleagues to Shakespeare's plays or to the latest English and American textual critical studies. To state as he does (p. 7) that *Lear* immediately precedes *Othello*, though he instantly adds, "or succeeds," is to disregard the latest and best chronology of Shakespeare's plays. To call *Hamlet* a play "not published with the author's consent and in both Quartos garbled" (p. 109) is to fly in the face of the best textual criticism of the day. Evidence of "garbling" in the second Quarto would, I venture to say, be somewhat difficult to produce. All this accords, unhappily, with



the author's disdain, to use no harsher word, of his fellows in the field of Shakespearean studies. "Clutton-Brock cannot or will not read Shakespeare's score, Mr. Knight cannot or will not read the text. He reads the letters only." (p. 31 n.) Strong flavor of the *furor academicus*, such as we are more apt to associate with the work of German than English-speaking scholars, unfortunately permeates too much of *Art and Artifice*.

We may admit at once that Mr. Stoll's main contention is true, that Shakespeare's plays start from "postulates," that we must accept and employ "conventions" that modern rationalism discards in literature as in life. Yet he hurts his case again and again by over-insistence on these points, by suppression of facts, and even by a wresting of the text. He seems at least to ignore the fact that Shakespeare over and over does his best to make the incredible "postulate" plausible. The device of the caskets in the *Merchant of Venice* is an "improbable postulate" taken over from the source; but Shakespeare adds that the deviser, Portia's father, was "ever virtuous; and holy men at their deaths have good inspirations" and therefore that the right choice will never be made but by "one who shall rightly love," not as in Mr. Stoll's words by the "cleverest at conundrums" (p. 159). He overlooks or minimizes the choleric nature of King Lear—"irascibility" is Stoll's word—but Lear's outburst of wrath against his faithful Kent is Shakespeare's invention—there is nothing like it in the old play—invented no doubt to make more credible his treatment of Cordelia. Now Wrath is one of the Seven Deadly Sins and Lear's redemption is not accomplished till his soul is purged of Wrath and filled with Love. It is however, in his treatment of the "believed-slander convention" in *Othello* that Mr. Stoll does most violence to the text. After all Iago is not to Othello, "a stranger" (p. 17) but his old companion in arms

of whom his eyes had seen the proof  
At Rhodes, at Cyprus, and on other grounds.

Iago's report of Cassio's behavior is not altogether "false" (p. 29) and is introduced by Shakespeare—it is not found in Cinthio—to render more credible Othello's belief of what is a false report in the next act. Mr. Stoll speaks slightly of the "loss of a handkerchief" and remarks that "the husbands and wives that we know" would not take it very seriously (p. 42 n.). But it is not a handkerchief, but *the* handkerchief, a love-talisman, Othello's first gift to his wife. A modern husband would have to have unbounded faith in his wife—or in himself—to hear untroubled that she had given such a token to a gallant and amorous young officer. And all these details are invented by Shakespeare to add realism and plausibility to the "convention."

In the chapter on *Hamlet* Mr. Stoll renews his attack upon what

seems to him a figment of romantic criticism, the irresolute procrastinating Prince of Coleridge and Goethe, the melancholiac of Bradley. All very well, but one would imagine that this ghost had been well laid by this time; and Mr. Stoll's brave young prince, heroic and successful revenger, seems sadly short of a full and rounded portrait. Hamlet is scholar and courtier as well as soldier; his taste in drama marks him as a scholar in Sir Philip Sidney's school; his advice to the players, a scene that Stoll could dispense with (p. 50) marks him as a courtly Elizabethan lover of the drama. When Mr. Stoll declares (p. 130) that for the rant of Hamlet and Laertes at Ophelia's grave "there can be no excuse for the Prince but the one—which the dramatist gives him afterwards and for Laertes, none whatever," the reader, or at least this reviewer, wonders whether the author is not deserting his own central principle that Shakespeare cared more for situation than for character. Here certainly is a highly emotional, effective theatrical situation. Has it ever been omitted in the many stage versions of *Hamlet*? It might even be possible to show that the behavior of the two young men was in thorough accord with their characters as previously revealed by the poet-playwright. But such an attempt would outrun the limits of a review already too long.

A word must be said in closing on the composition in general and the style in particular of the book. Mr. Stoll announces it as a synthesis of his "opinions concerning Shakespeare's central structure" (p. 4). To the reviewer it seems not so much a synthesis as a conglomeration of old and new, long extracts from earlier work, repeated references to earlier work not always readily accessible—once indeed to an unpublished article (p. 85 n.) an intercalated chapter on Drama, Epic and Novel, and a last note on Chaucer's *Troilus and Cressida*. One would express the hope that this, Mr. Stoll's latest, is not his last book on Shakespeare. A true synthesis of his many fruitful years of study, purged of the bitterness of controversy, and free from the repellant dogmatism which mars this book, would indeed be welcome. And when it comes may we hope that this great scholar will pay a little more attention to the language in which his final synthesis is presented. Too often sentences, paragraphs even, of *Art and Artifice*, read as if they were written to be spoken in a lecture room where the speaker's voice and manner of delivery puts over what would puzzle the unaided reader. Tangled sentences interrupted by parentheses, inverted clauses, omissions and substitutions are all too common. Professor Stoll's learning like that of the late Professor Saintsbury is far-reaching and profound, but that is hardly an excuse for his writing in Saintsbury's exasperating manner.

T. M. PARROTT

*Princeton University*

*Christopher Marlowe in London.* By MARK ECCLES. Harvard Studies in English, X. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. vi + 185. \$2.50.

Curiosity concerning the life of Christopher Marlowe can hardly be said to have existed before the nineteenth century, except for fitful flashes of it in the mind of Edmund Malone. So little was really known of him as recently as 1819 that one scholar gravely explained 'Marlowe' as merely a *nom de guerre* assumed by Shakespeare during his apprentice period in the theatres. The accretion of biographical material that began with Dyce's memoir in 1850 (the first account of the author that could at all be called a 'life') was considerable; but the mainly casual discoveries of three generations of litterateurs paled in the light of Mr. Hotson's brilliant search of Record Office documents ten years ago.

This generation had little right to expect another spark from heaven to fall, and cynics will be disposed either to exclaim upon Mr. Eccles' luck or to revile the sloth of his predecessors for leaving him such extraordinary pickings. Extraordinary they are indeed, and richly deserved, for the method of Mr. Eccles is that of his friend Mr. Hotson and they have generously supplemented each other's resources.

Future biographers of Marlowe will know that Marlowe was a close friend of Thomas Watson, the poet-scholar (whom Mr. Eccles' publisher foully miscalls 'Washburn' in the jacket-notice of the book); that they were comrades in a street brawl that led to the death of one William Bradley at Watson's hands, for which fact both poets went for a time to Newgate Prison. They will understand, as no one has hitherto, the background and reason of the bond which Marlowe and his two sureties delivered on October 1, 1589 for Marlowe's appearance at the Newgate Gaol Delivery, and they will be obliged to include among Marlowe's works the Latin dedication of Watson's posthumous *Amintae Gaudia* to the Countess of Pembroke (in 1592), which bears the signature, 'C. M.'

Still more important for the reconstruction of Marlowe's life in London is Mr. Eccles' discovery of his local habitation. It was Norton Folgate at the time of Bradley's death in 1589 and was still in the same immediate neighborhood at least in 1592, when a recognizance which Mr. Eccles has found in the Middlesex Guildhall, Westminster, shows Marlowe giving bond for his appearance at the next general session of the peace and pledging himself meantime to innocuous conduct toward the constable and sub-constable of Holywell-street. Norton Folgate and Holywell-street were very close to each other, if not alternative designations of the same district, which was also very close to the Theatre and Curtain

playhouses and the actors' church of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch. Mr. Eccles reminds us of Beeston's report that Shakespeare lived also in Shoreditch and shows cause for believing that his residence there was contemporary with Marlowe's.

It would not be fair to the reader, and it would be impossible in the limits of a review, to record all the new information that Mr. Eccles' prosperous industry has assembled. It is admirably and excitingly set forth in the book. The effect of the new light upon our personal judgment of Marlowe must be confessed to be meliorative. Considered absolutely, the causes both of his incarceration in Newgate and of his death are much less sulphurous than the imaginations of twenty years ago were apt to conceive them; considered relatively to what the records tell us of the ordinary chances of Elizabethan life, they lose still more of the sinister distinction which the clergymen-editors of the Victorian era tended to give them. Not only Marlowe and Ben Jonson, we now know, but the honey-tongued John Day and the pastoral Porter figured (and more than once) in fatal brawls. If Shakespeare has not yet been shown to have effectively wielded lethal arms, we do know that a man swore to the Southwark police that he went in deadly fear of him; and the things which Mr. Eccles has elsewhere divulged about that 'exquisite' author of *Parthenophil*, Barnabe Barnes, make mere homicide look prosaic.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

*Jean Regnaud de Segrais, l'homme et son œuvre.* Par WESSIE M. TIPPING. Paris: les Editions Internationales, 1933. Pp. 261.

It was an interesting idea to have made a study of Segrais, on whom nothing of importance has been written since the publication in 1863 by Brédif, *Segrais, sa vie et ses œuvres*, a rather dry and inaccessible work, containing many gaps and inaccuracies. Thus the author of the present volume, thanks to careful research among the papers of Pierre Carel in the municipal library at Caen, is able to give a detailed account of Segrais' life, hitherto only vaguely known. She also corrects many errors made by Brédif in regard to his works. In fact, at every step in her study she gives proof of careful erudition which never becomes pedantic. Her twenty-three page bibliography testifies to her conscientious research. Her style is remarkably pure, with scarcely a phrase to betray the fact that French is not her native language.

If Miss Tipping wisely does not overestimate the literary value of Segrais' works, she does realize the keen interest attached to a study of his milieu and in a most delightful fashion introduces the reader to the intimate life of the brilliant period which he

traversed. We see him as the "Voiture caennais" of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, as a member of the "Ordre des Chevaliers de la Moquette" of the comtesse de Fiesque, and as a constant friend of the Scarron household. A vivid picture is given of the capricious Mlle de Montpensier, whose discreet collaborator he was. We become familiar with Mme de Lafayette's circle of friends. We follow Segrain to the French Academy and to the academy at Caen. A few interesting details are given about the latter, one of the most illustrious of the provincial academies, to judge from its eminent members, but about whose early years, curiously enough, very little is known.

Miss Tipping recognizes the historical importance of Segrain's works. His *poèmes galants* written at Saint-Fargeau are a gallery of portraits of the noted folk who surrounded la Grande Mademoiselle and a mirror of the diversions of her court. His *Eglogues*, admired by the critical Boileau and by Victor Hugo, revived in France the bucolic genre introduced half a century earlier by Racan, and paved the way for Chénier. A valuable appendix to the *Segrais* publishes, among many poems which have not been included in any edition of Segrain's works, his eighth *Eglogue*, a eulogy of the princesse de Bavière. His most important contribution is his *Nouvelles Françaises*, which contains an entire code of rules out of which the modern novel was to develop. This chapter of Miss Tipping's book is all the more important since the *Nouvelles* are very rare and difficult to obtain for first hand reading. With sure judgment and in an alert style, she analyzes them, maliciously pointing out their weaknesses, as well as dwelling on their merits. One of them, *Eugénie*, before Mme de Lafayette made it her favorite theme, dealt with the sentimental life of a married woman.

If in her study of the relations between Segrain and Mme de Lafayette, the author concludes that he had very little share in the latter's works, she does insist, nevertheless, on the fact that by his theories on the *nouvelle*, Segrain paved the way for Mme de Lafayette, and that is no mean merit. In fact, the weakness of the book is that a more detailed study could have been made of the development of Mme de Lafayette's novel through the *nouvelle* of Segrain. However, that would have required a different approach to the subject.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*Spenser in Southern Ireland.* By A. C. JUDSON. Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press, 1933. Pp. 60. Mr. Judson's book is not a biographical study as its title might seem to indicate but a story of the author's visit to the Spenser country in Southern Ireland. His unassuming text with its charming illustrations has the happy effect of taking the poet for a moment out of the library in which our higher scholarship has so much the habit of finding him and leaving him. In the pursuit of our studies we are in some danger of forgetting that Spenser like his master Chaucer was a lover of nature as well as of books. Of this tendency Mr. Judson's essay is a welcome corrective. In the pursuit of his pleasant form of research the author has glimpsed through the veil of the poet's myth and allegory Spenser's accurate observation of the rivers and mountains about his castle home.

---

*A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700.* (A Publication of the Tudor and Stuart Club.) By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xiv + 62. \$2.75. In this bibliography of Spenser Mr. Johnson has undertaken a meticulous description of all editions of the poet's works that appeared prior to the eighteenth century. This includes in each case a transcript of the title page, an itemization of contents, an account of format, collation, and running-title, and a notation of the entry in the Stationers' Register. Where the copy used has a colophon, this is duly described, and in some cases it has been found necessary to comment upon foliation, pagination, water-marks, and the quality of the paper used. These summary descriptions are supplemented with notes which furnish further pertinent information and deal succinctly with controversial questions.

In preparing his bibliography Mr. Johnson has depended particularly upon the excellent Spenser collection in the Tudor and Stuart Club Library at Johns Hopkins University. However, he has had the use of copies treasured elsewhere; *e. g.*, the Huth-Clawson *Shepheardes Calender* of 1579, the Britwell copy of the Spenser-Harvey letters (1580), and the Boston Public Library *Daphnaïda* (1591). The bibliography does not attempt a complete census of copies, but many other copies than the one used are recorded and in some instances an estimate made of the total number in existence. Furthermore, there are included comparative studies of the copies consulted. While Mr. Johnson does not pretend to have covered the whole field of the early copies he has clearly covered the signi-

ficant part of it, and it would certainly have been unwise for him to delay the publication of his invaluable book until he had made more extensive researches. Not only bibliographers but investigators of literary problems, which nowadays so often include bibliographical questions, will find his book indispensable. The interest and attractiveness of the publication are enhanced by the reproduction of as many as eleven title-pages.

H. S. V. JONES

*University of Illinois*

---

*Sir Thomas Wyatt and Some Collected Studies.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1933. Pp. vii + 228. 7/6 net. This volume includes four essays previously published: "Some Points in the Grail Legend," "Sir Thomas Malory," "Some Aspects of Medieval Lyric," and "The English Pastoral"; two new essays, "Sir Thomas Wyatt" and "The Disenchantment of the Elizabethans"; and in an Appendix the fragment of "The Court of Venus," now in the possession of the Folger Library. The paper on "Sir Thomas Wyatt" is a careful re-examination of the data bearing upon the poet's life and the extant poetry. Students of Wyatt will be especially interested in the suggestion that the metrical irregularities of the early sonnets result from the fact that they were "mere exercises in translation or adaptation, roughly jotted down in whatever broken rhythms came readiest to hand, and intended perhaps for subsequent polishing at some time of leisure which never presented itself." Rather convincing is the organization of evidence to uphold the traditional theory that Wyatt and Anna Boleyn were at one time intimate, and a fresh biographical contribution is made in the conclusive evidence that Elizabeth Darrell was the mistress of Wyatt's latest years, and perhaps the Phillis of his poetry. "The Disenchantment of the Elizabethans" will fascinate all students of the period. While recognizing the large degree of truth in the traditional concept of Elizabethanism as "sensuous, comprehensive, extravagant, disorderly, thirsty for beauty, abounding in the zest of life," Sir Edmund aims to present the other side of the picture, "the instability of human reckonings" as reflected in Samuel Daniel's verse, the "sense of the fleetingness of all worldly goods" which haunts the verse of Robert Southwell, written always "in the imminent shadow of death," and the "note of disillusion" which is "a constant undersong in the full strain of court poetry itself." The essays in this volume are scholarship at its best, combining as they do scientific thoroughness with refined appreciation of literary values, and couched in prose that is fluent and delicately exact.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD

*University of Washington*

*The City-Madam A Comedy By Philip Massinger.* Edited by RUDOLF KIRK. Princeton: University Press, 1934. Pp. x + 184. \$2.00. The chief contribution of this volume is an account of the stage history of *The City Madam*, its imitations and adaptations. A more detailed discussion of the merits of the play would have been welcome. Luke, one of the greatest hypocrites before Tarruffe, really deserves fuller treatment. The loose ends referred to (p. 55 and note 157) may have resulted from tampering with the MS after it left the author's hands (probably about 1624-6, as Mr. Kirk thinks). Lord Lacie's financial condition is referred to in many places (I, i, 54; I, ii, 39 ff.; II, iii, 40, for instance) and should not cause surprise. Luke's plot does, however, need elucidation. Mr. Kirk has identified the printer as Jane Bell and has accumulated some very interesting information about the publisher, Andrew Pennycuicke, and his patrons. I find it difficult to agree that the Bodleian copy dedicated to John Wrath was necessarily "the first one to come off the press" and that "its patron was the one who first had the honor of receiving this comedy of Massinger" (pp. 12-3). Eleven of the dozen or more errors peculiar to this copy occur in the inner form of signature G, which is obviously in an uncorrected state. It can hardly be more than coincidence that only one copy with this dedication and this uncorrected form has come to public attention. In a casual examination of several copies of the quarto I have noted a difference in watermarks not mentioned by Mr. Kirk (the reference on p. 6 should be to numbers 170 to 175). Sheet C in the Bridgewater copy in the Library of Congress has a large circular watermark, as do sheets C and H in British Museum copy 11775. bb. 21. Collation of two gatherings with the Library of Congress copy reveals a few differences: I, i, 60 reads "Me thinks"; 94, "Featur'd"; 104, "Chicken."; 113, "lowsie."; 124, "withall duty"; IV, iv, 157, "rellishes"; V, i, 23, "an Atome"; 43, "fit fort his" (this explains "for his" in C and M); 113, "soveraignty." At IV, iii, 11, the spelling is "compulsion." The editor is probably wise to ignore the frequent interchange of Roman and italic capital letters, but would it not be a good idea to capitalize the initial letter in every line and record the change in the variants?

JAMES G. MCMANAWAY

*The Johns Hopkins University*



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

APRIL, 1935

Number 4

---

## VOLTAIRE AND BAILLET'S MANUAL OF PSEUDONYMS

Few people are acquainted with Adrien Baillet's *Auteurs déguisez sous des noms étrangers, empruntez, supposez, feints à plaisir, chiffrez, renversez, retournez, ou changez d'une langue en une autre* which was published at Paris, "chez Antoine Dezallier, rue S. Jacques, à la couronne d'or," in 1690. And yet the book, a very sizable well-indexed tome of some 615 pages, is not without merit. To be sure it is not to be compared with Quérard or Barbier, since it is a treatise rather than a catalogue. The work, written ostensibly to amuse as well as to instruct, is divided in orderly fashion into four compartments. The first contains several chapters which deal with general reflexions on change of name and the customs usually observed in such a procedure. The second concerns the motives which authors have had to change their names and disguise themselves. The third outlines and treats of the ways in which they have brought about the modification. Finally, part four discusses the inconveniences caused by writers who have taken this step.

Baillet's treatise is a veritable handbook for one wishing to adopt a pseudonym. Not only are the methods devised to conceal one's name discussed at length, but also the motives instigating the act are fully analyzed. These reasons are succinctly summarized in one brief passage:

Mais pour nous tenir renfermés dans le ressort des lettres, il suffira de vous faire remarquer parmi les principaux motifs qui ont porté les auteurs à changer de nom, l'amour de l'antiquité profane qui a excité plusieurs de nos modernes à prendre des noms qui étaient de l'usage de l'ancienne Grèce ou de l'ancienne Rome; la prudence qui a fait chercher aux auteurs les moyens d'arriver à leurs fins sans être reconnus; la crainte des disgrâces et des peines de la part des adversaires qui ont le crédit et l'autorité en main; la honte que l'on a de produire ou de publier quelque chose qui

seroit indigne de son rang ou de sa profession; et la confusion qui pourroit revenir des écrits, du succès desquels on a quelque raison de se défier; le dessein de sonder les esprits sur quelque chose qui pourroit paroître nouveau, et sujet à être bien ou mal regu; la fantaisie de cacher la bassesse de sa naissance ou de son rang, et celle de rehausser quelquefois sa qualité; le désir d'ôter l'idée que pourroit donner un nom qui ne seroit pas d'un son agréable ou d'une signification heureuse.

Il ne faut pas oublier d'y ajouter la modestie de ceux qui ne se soucient pas de paroître ni de recueillir les fruits passagers de leurs travaux; la piété de ceux qui veulent laisser des marques extérieures de leur changement de vie; la fourbe et l'imposture pour séduire les simples et les ignorants qui ne peuvent juger du fonds que par la surface; la vanité qui donne quelquefois le change à la modestie au sujet du mépris qu'on peut faire de la gloire à laquelle les autres aspirent en écrivant; la médisance ou l'envie de médire avec impunité, et d'injurier à son aise; l'impiété et le libertinage d'esprit, dont le motif a beaucoup de rapport avec la crainte d'être découvert et de s'attirer quelque tempête; enfin le mouvement d'une pure gaieté de cœur excitée par quelque rencontre, ou par un simple caprice de l'imagination.

Baillet lists twenty-one different procedures to be followed in effecting this particular disguise: one may change his name into that of some place of birth, dwelling, fief, seignury, or "bénéfice." An author may take the name of another. Or he may fashion a patronymic after the manner of the Greeks from one of his ancestors. He may adopt a name of a profession, or rank, or even that of a Society, Academy, or monastery. He may assume a "nom de guerre." He may disguise himself with a sobriquet. Sometimes he finds his pseudonym in the subject-matter, in one of the characters or even in the title of his work. He may "affecter l'antiphrase" or "prendre des synonymes," or adopt a cognomen whose meaning is close to that of the one suppressed. He may translate his name from one language to another, change his Christian name, increase or decrease the number of his surnames. He may devise an anagram of his original name, design a new one from the initials of the original, lengthen or shorten his own.

The book of Baillet, thorough and interesting as it is, must never have been a seventeenth-century best seller. It was however reprinted in 1722 in volume VI of the *Jugements des savants*, considerably annotated by De la Monnoye. In the course of time, one copy of the 1690 edition was taken into the Bastille under circumstances which have been discussed fully by Funck-Brentano.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de la France*, XLV, 33.

René-Auguste Constantin de Renneville having been imprisoned in the Bastille on May 16, 1702, for treason, received the following year from a friend a copy of the *Auteurs déguisez*. A note confirming the gift and written in the hand of Renneville can even now be seen at the beginning of his copy:

Ce livre m'a été donné à la Bastille par le très révérend Père Florent de Brandebourg, capucin, suivant le billet de sa main dont je suis porteur ce 23 juin 1703. De Constantin.

When on June 16, 1713, De Constantin was released, the *Auteurs déguisez* was left behind. Another note, dated December 26, 1753, written by the major of the Bastille, Chevalier, and still attached to the volume explains why it was not taken out:

Il n'est pas douteux que ce livre a été retenu au Sieur Constantin, lors de sa translation parce qu'il y a plusieurs traits injurieux contre Mm. de Saint-Mars et Bernaville, anciens gouverneurs de la Bastille et contre d'autres personnes aussi, moyennant quoy il a resté au château annexé à la Bastille. Ce livre a couru toutes les chambres depuis cinquante ans, et a été lu de tous les prisonniers qui ont eu la permission d'avoir des livres.

Among those who had access to Baillet's book was Voltaire. Besides the statement of Chevalier that all who were permitted to have books<sup>2</sup> read this one, we also have the evidence of La Beaumelle who in his *Commentaire sur la Henriade* (1769) maintained that Voltaire had extracted from the manuscript verses which Constantin had written in the book the most beautiful canto of the *Henriade*.<sup>3</sup> While we are not at all prepared to say that the latter remark of La Beaumelle is correct, we may accept his statement as corroborating that of Chevalier. There can be no doubt that (1) the book was in the Bastille at the time of Voltaire's first imprisonment, (2) that Voltaire had permission to read it, and (3) that he actually read it or at least portions of it during his eleven-month sojourn there.

Voltaire's accidental acquaintance with Baillet's work could have been a factor, hitherto unrecognized, in his change of name. It will be remembered that he adopted the new name immediately after leaving the Bastille. The causes and circumstances which led

<sup>2</sup> That Voltaire was permitted to have books can be seen from a receipt dated "Ce jeudi 21 may 1717" and signed "Arouet." See Delort, *Histoire de la détention des philosophes à la Bastille*, II, 22.

<sup>3</sup> See *Catalogue général*, *ibid.*

him to do so have already been discussed in *PMLA*.<sup>4</sup> It is fairly apparent now that the immediate incentive for the change had its origin in Baillet's manual.

It is unreasonable to suppose, however, that the idea could not have occurred to Voltaire before the perusal of the *Auteurs déguisez*. There is even much evidence which points to the theory that he had long been dissatisfied with the plebeian Arouet. But it is reasonable to assume that it was Baillet's book which at the opportune moment of an enforced leisure crystallized in the poet's mind the determination to consummate what he had for some time been desirous of doing.

The *Auteurs déguisez* should not only be cited as crystallizing in Voltaire's mind the desire to change his name. There are indications that it contained suggestions of considerable moment to Voltaire upon how to effect the change. The first chapter, which deals with methods discussed by Baillet (Part III, Chapter 1), is entitled, rather significantly, it seems:

1ère Manière. Changer son nom de famille en celui de quelque lieu.  
1. En celui du pays natal. 2. En celui du lieu de la demeure. 3. En celui d'un fief ou Seigneurie. 4. En celui du lieu du bénéfice qu'on possède.

Young Arouet's attention must have been attracted to such key words in the title of the chapter as "pays natal," "demeure," "fief ou seigneurie," "bénéfice." Such words would immediately bring to his mind definite associations with Saint-Loup and Airvault. To be sure, he could call himself M. de St. Loup without violating the rules of the game as Baillet was expounding them. He had not the right, however, to call himself M. d'Airvault, for he had neither "fief, seigneurie, or bénéfice" at that place. It would seem that at that juncture, Arouet remembered a second suggestion made by Baillet in an earlier portion of the book. In Part II, Baillet treats of (Chapter vi) "La Fantaisie de cacher la bassesse de sa naissance ou de sa condition: et celle de rehausser quelquefois sa qualité." The author cites the cases of two Italians (Pomponius Laetus and Sabellicus) who changed their names for this reason. Then, page 143-144, he relates the following incident:

On peut dire que la même fatalité est venuë chercher en France ceux qui ont voulu suivre ces Italiens dans de semblables fantaisies. Je n'en veux point d'autre exemple que celui du fameux Guillaume Postel. Vous

<sup>4</sup> XLIV (1929), 546 ff.

sçavez, Monsieur, qu'il était né de la lie du petit peuple en basse Normandie, et que rien n'était plus obscur que sa naissance, ni rien presque plus inconnu que ses parens. L'indigence et les misères qui l'environnèrent dans son enfance et dans sa jeunesse, ne lui donnèrent pas la pensée de s'élever au-dessus de sa condition. Mais la fortune ayant enfin favorisé l'industrie et les travaux de ses études, il se laissa enfler le cœur par ces succès, et se voyant assez riche des pensions du Roi François I et des appointements de sa charge de lecteur du Roy, il songea aux moyens de s'annoblir. Il voulut d'abord se prévaloir du nom de Postel, à cause de sa ressemblance avec celui des Pôtels ou Postels Gentilshommes d'ancienne race en Normandie. Voyant peut-être que la chose ne réussissait pas à son gré, soit qu'il n'eust pas le consentement de Messieurs Pôtels, soit que ses compatriotes ou ses amis se mocquassent de lui, il se fit appeller *Dolerie* du nom d'une seigneurie qui appartenait effectivement aux Pôtels, et qui était d'ailleurs le lieu de sa naissance, dépendant de la Paroisse de Barenton au Diocèse d'Avranches. Il aurait mieux fait d'employer ses talens pour acquérir de la sagesse plutôt que de la noblesse. Mais sa vanité devait être punie de la peine des insensez, et ce fut par une espèce d'indulgence que la justice qui l'avait encore convaincu d'autre chose, se contenta de le faire renfermer.

Guillaume Postel must have suggested to young Arouet the method of adopting his new name. Postel went back to Barenton; Arouet went back to St. Loup. Postel adopted the fief *Dolerie* as his fief; Arouet adopted the Seignury of *Airvault*. Thus as Postel had become M. de la *Dolerie*, Arouet would become M. d'*Airvault*. Unfortunately, Postel had had two choices, whereas Arouet had only one. Postel could become M. de Postel which was a real seignury or he could become M. de la *Dolerie* which was a fief. However, as we have seen, he rejected the title M. de Postel, either since the real possessors of the name objected or because his contemporaries ridiculed his pretentiousness. Arouet could not have failed to foresee the same difficulties for the new M. d'*Airvault*.

At this point the youthful prisoner must have regarded the title of Baillet's book with some disgust. But precisely the solution to his problem was there: *Auteurs déguisez sous des noms étrangers, empruntez, supposez, feints à plaisir, chiffrez, renversez, retournez, ou changez d'une langue en une autre*. Two possible operations were suggested in this title: either that of reversing the *Airvault* or that of turning it into a foreign tongue such as Latin. Arouet chose the first.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> There seems to be no justification for assuming that the "It" of

The suggestions contained in the Postel story, in the title of Chapter I, part III, and in the title of Baillet's manual were sufficient to supply young Arouet with his new name. There was no further necessity to continue the reading of the treatise. In case, however, he did continue, he must have been startled to see the following in this same first chapter of part III:

Ils connaîtront *Platine*, *Gerson*, *L. Aretin*, *Volaterran*, *Rhodigin*, *Politien*: mais ils ne connaîtront peut-être pas *Saccus*, *Charlier*, *Brunus*, *Maffaeus*, *Richier*, *Bassus*, parce que *Saccus* a pris le nom de son village, qui est *Platine*, comme *Charlier* celui de *Gerson*, et les autres de la même manière.

In this sentence, after he had worked out his pseudonym, he could not fail to see a name very similar to the one he had just adopted. However, before the Voltaire had taken shape in his mind, the sentence did not have the slightest significance for him. Although *Volterrán* or *Volterránus*<sup>6</sup> were appropriate pseudonyms for Raphaël Maffei whose "pays natal" was Volterra, neither was fitting for Arouet who had no connection whatever with Volterra. Moreover, if Arouet, starting with no pattern of a pseudonym and reading the book, came upon this list, there was absolutely no reason why he should chose the *Volaterran* with its troublesome "a" from six names given. Any of the other five would have been as good a model upon which to fashion a new cognomen as the "volaterran." Thus it would seem that the sentence could not attract the attention of Arouet until *after* he had become M. de Voltaire. Then, however, he must have read it with great satisfaction, for it proved to him that he could now adopt the new name and *feel secure from detection*. For if, at some later date,

Airvault are sounded. However, on reversing the syllables "vault-air," the "t" would become pronounced in the same way that "il vit" pronounces the "t" in "vit-il?" "Vau[l]tair," however, as a pseudonym is as unsatisfactory as "Arouet" because of the puns upon the "veau" (cf. pleurer comme un veau) and "taire." Hence the change of "au" into "o." This change would necessitate pronouncing the "l" by analogy with such words as "volte," "volter," "volte-face," "voltige," "voltiger."

<sup>6</sup>There seems to be a confusion of two forms in Baillet's mind, both belonging to the same person. Raphaël Maffei (1452-1522), born at Volterra, Tuscany, and author of the *Commentarii rerum urbanarum libri XXXVIII* as well as the *Vitae summorum pontificum Sixte IV, Innocentii VIII, Alexandri VI et Pie III* (Venise, 1518, in-8.), was surnamed *Volterránus* or *Volterrán*. Baillet seems to have confused the Latin and the Italian forms when he wrote *Volaterran*.

someone should say (and, indeed, Chevrier did make the statement) that the pseudonym came from Volterra in Tuscany, he would but add an additional complication to the solution of the origin of the name Voltaire.

Thus François Marie Arouet, entering the Bastille on May 17, 1717, with a desire for some name more noble than his own, found a work which changed that desire into a determination. The book, however, did more than strengthen his determination. It furnished him with material and examples which suggested the pattern of his new name. On leaving the Bastille, François Marie Arouet became, thanks to the gift of a book made to a previous prisoner, M. Arouet de Voltaire. Nor did he forget the lessons he had learned in the *Auteurs déguisez*. If one examines the pseudonyms which he employed later in his works, one will find that he very nearly exhausted in the course of his life all the twenty-one methods of changing one's name which Baillet expounded.

IRA WADE

Princeton University

## SOME NEGLECTED LETTERS OF VOLTAIRE

Professor Lucien Foulet, in that masterpiece of scholarship called *la Correspondance de Voltaire*, mentions the important Saint Fargeau collection of Voltaire's letters. It is in that collection that the writer found the few letters that follow. They are addressed to Mme de St. Julien,<sup>1</sup> member of an illustrious family, La Tour du Pin de Charce. She was a sister of the marquis de Gouvernet, "commandant en Bourgogne" and a relative of the duc de Richelieu. She had consequently important connections at court, including Choiseul, Saint-Florentin and Turgot, and it was through her that Voltaire procured many favors for himself and his colony. Mme de St. Julien seems to have been a woman of independent mind and great personal charm. She was a devotee of the hunt and won a medal from the patriarch for her skill in shooting. She apparently had a penchant for wearing male attire about which Voltaire jollies her on occasion. He nicknames her his "papillon-philosophe" and in an epistle to her he calls her "femme aimable,

<sup>1</sup> She died May 9, 1820.

honnête homme, esprit libre et hardi.”<sup>2</sup> However the highest compliment he can pay her is to say that she resembles Mme du Châtelet in “l'éloquence, l'enfantillage, et la bonté avec un peu de sa physionomie.”<sup>3</sup> She evidently enjoyed her visits to Ferney for she came to spend a part of the summer there in 1766, in 1772, and in 1775. Moland published numerous letters from Voltaire to her, of which the earliest seem to date from September, 1766. These published here appear to have been written in 1778 shortly before the poet's death.

## I

Un pauvre malade de quatre vingt quatre ans, n'a de consolation que dans vos bontés; des discours ridicules et des démarches de meme auxquelles il est impossible que j'aye la moindre part ne doivent pas me priver de ces bontés qui fesaient toute la douceur de ma vie. Vous sentez bien que je n'ay jamais pu adopter d'autre projet que celui de vous être attaché à jamais.

## II

le vieux malade ne peut être que sur les six heures aux ordres de Madame de St. Julien. Son cœur y est pour le reste de sa vie.

## III

que le jour du saint vendredi il ait chanté Eli, Eli cela ne fait rien à l'histoire, etc.

Le vieux malade n'en peut plus il n'entend parler ni d'architecte ni de notaire.<sup>4</sup>

Il grille d'achever ses jours dans la cour de Madame de St. Julien.

FRANK J. CROWLEY

*University of California at Los Angeles*

COLERIDGE MARGINALIA IN JACOBI'S *WERKE*

Among the philosophical and theological books bequeathed to the University of Vermont by William Greenough Thayer Shedd, a graduate of the College in the Class of 1839 and Professor of English Literature from 1845 to 1852, are seven squat volumes of Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi's *Werke* published under various dates

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres*, X, 585.

<sup>3</sup> XLIV, 427.

<sup>4</sup> Mme de St. Julien was acting as an intermediary between M. de Villarceaux and Voltaire regarding the purchase of a residence in Paris. The architect was probably Chalgrin. Cf. L, 387.



beginning with 1812 and concluding with 1825. They are of importance to Coleridgeans because, for one thing, Shedd used them in preparing his Introductory Essay to *The Complete Works* of Coleridge, still the standard edition,<sup>1</sup> in which appeared the earliest discussion of "the resemblance between Coleridge and Jacobi";<sup>2</sup> and, for another, because this copy contains Shedd's transcripts of Coleridge's marginalia which he found in two of the three volumes of Jacobi, from Dr. Green's library, when they were offered for sale at New York in 1884.<sup>3</sup> It is significant that of all the notes contained in the "thirty-nine items" available to Shedd at that time, and now for the most part lost, he transcribed, so far as can be discovered, only those in the Jacobi; although he purchased, and eventually presented to the University of Vermont, the copy of Descartes' *Opera Philosophica*, 1685, which contains a few of Coleridge's marginalia.<sup>4</sup>

Shedd's transcripts are given just as they stand, including crotchets and the material within them, without meddling of any sort. Inside the front cover of volume II (1815) Shedd wrote:

On p. 217, is a note of S. T. Coleridge which I transcribed from his copy of Jacobi, imported by Scribner & Welford April 1884. WGT. S—

The note is on a slip pasted to page 217:

Kant was analyzing not human nature, but the speculative Intellect. And what in all grace(?) can speculation be but *Form*? What can a thought be but a Thought? Of all men, Jacobi with his Faith of and in Reason ought to have been the last to have made these objections.

Reference is to a passage on page 217 of *David Hume über den Glauben, oder Idealismus und Realismus*, "Kant" written in the margin and *leeres Blendwerk* underlined:

Ich bin alles, und ausser mir ist im eigentlichen Verstande Nichts. Und Ich, mein Alles, bin denn am Ende doch auch nur ein leeres Blendwerk

<sup>1</sup> New York, 1853.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Elisabeth Winkelmann, *Coleridge und die Kantische Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1933, p. 129. That Shedd used this copy is clear from notes and markings opposite passages cited or adapted in the Essay.

<sup>3</sup> For details see J. L. Haney, *A Bibliography of S. T. C.*, Philadelphia, 1903, p. 117, No. 158. Shedd's copy (complete, 6 volumes bound as 7) is of the same edition as Coleridge's (incomplete, Vol. I, 1812, III, 1816).

<sup>4</sup> "Coleridge Marginalia in a Volume of Descartes," by the present writer, *PMLA*, XLIX (March, 1934), 184-195.

von Etwas; die Form einer Form; gerade so ein Gespenst, wie die andern Erscheinungen die ich Dinge nenne, wie die ganze Natur, ihre Ordnung und ihre Gesetze.

One remarks especially in Coleridge's comment the expression of dismay, as perhaps arising from sudden discovery of fact inconsistent with a previously accepted belief about Jacobi's views. With this before us it is important to point out that in the *Biographia Literaria*, written in 1815, there is only one reference to Jacobi, the relation of an anecdote from Jacobi's *Ueber die Lehre des Spinoza, in Briefen an Herrn Moses Mendelssohn* (1785),<sup>5</sup> which is only a kind of philosophical joke. From this alone, in anticipation of what follows, it is apparent that with the perusal of Volumes II and III of the *Werke*, from which, with the one exception just cited, all of his borrowings from Jacobi were taken and these used solely in the *Friend* (1818),<sup>6</sup> Coleridge first came to grips with Jacobi on the fundamental doctrine of "Reason." As the notes show, he passes quickly from simple dismay to complete dismissal in the end.

The first sentence of the note is similar to one found in the *Biographia Literaria*.<sup>7</sup> Coleridge giving an account of his debt to Kant says:

The few passages that remained obscure to me . . . I soon found were hints and insinuations referring to ideas, which Kant either did not think it prudent to avow, or which he considered as consistently *left behind* in a pure analysis, not of human nature *in toto*, but of the speculative intellect alone.

The rest of this passage will be quoted in relation to the third note below. The notes are certainly later than the *Biographia*.

As in the case of Volume II, Shedd wrote inside the front cover of Volume III:

On pp. 42, 195, 387 are some notes of S. T. Coleridge which I transcribed from his copy of Jacobi, imported by Scribner and Welford April 1884. The copy was from the library of Dr. Joseph Green.

<sup>5</sup> Coleridge's *Works*, III, 483; and Jacobi's *Werke*, IV, 1-2, p. 79. J. H. Muirhead, *Coleridge as Philosopher*, p. 271, mentions other marginalia in Jacobi's Comments on Maas's *Versuch über die Lehre d. Spinoza in Briefen an den Herrn Moses Mendelssohn*.

<sup>6</sup> Winkelmann, *op. cit.*, 131, 133.

<sup>7</sup> New York, 1847, I, 265; *Works*, III, 258.

A slip pasted to page 42 gives the second note as follows:

And what is Jacobi's mystery? Is it not the organ of spiritual Truth? And what is this but the *real* Ich that shines through the *empirical* Ich—the correspondance of which with the former is categorically demanded. Kant's sublime mystery is one and the same with Jacobi's unintelligible revealed mystery, the very revelation of which is most mysterious. Jacobi too often betrays a captious envious bissigen Geist.

The matter referred to on page 42, *geheimnissvolles* underlined, is from *Jacobi an Fichte*:

Nie habe ich begriffen, wie man in Kants kategorischen Imperativ, der aus dem Triebe der mit sich selbst Uebereinstimmung so leicht zu deduciren ist, (ich verweise auf die oben angeführten Aphorismen) etwas geheimnissvolles und unbegreifliches finden, und es unternehmen konnte, nachher, mit diesem Unbegreiflichen, die Lückenbüsser der theoretischen Vernunft zu Bedingungen der Realität der Gesetze der praktischen zu machen. In keiner Philosophie habe ich für mich ein grösseres Aergerniss als dieses angetroffen.

In his *Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen von des Herrn Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi* (1812), page 54 f., Schelling, in berating Jacobi for replacing his own ambiguous "Gefühl" with Kant's "Vernunft" when once he became aware of its meaning<sup>8</sup> and thus degrading "Reason" without in the least improving his own matter, quoted in a footnote this same section on which Coleridge penned his annotation, although in a version, from an earlier edition, showing some slight differences. Both Coleridge and Schelling voice protests, but they are not prompted by the same motive and their remarks differ widely in tone and tenor, Coleridge's sympathy with Jacobi and his attempt to find a basis of agreement with Kant being particularly noticeable. There is significance here of which account will be taken later.

Page 195 bears another attached sheet on which is written this vigorous outburst, the third note:

To kick at a dying or dead Lion is but an asine [*sic*] Trick! It is most remarkable that neither Jacobi should have seen nor Schelling reminded him, that in a critical analysis of the *speculative* Intellect, KANT could do no other than ground the Belief of Reason as he did. But in his critique of the *Practical* Reason does he there represent this Faith as deriving its Rights<sup>9</sup> from 'a lazy Postulate'? O shame to Jacobi! O shame and

<sup>8</sup> Cf. J. H. Muirhead, "Metaphysician or Mystic?" in *Coleridge Studies by Several Hands*, London, 1934, p. 186.

<sup>9</sup> "Rights" is substituted for "force," which is crossed out.

double shame to Schelling, his Antagonist! For he knew and had himself pointed it out. S. T. C.

The passage referred to is from *Ueber das Unternehmen des Kriticismus, die Vernunft zu Verstande zu bringen*. It seems necessary to quote the whole paragraph to preserve intelligible continuity.

Wahrheit, Schönheit und Tugend! Mit ihnen treten wir ins Reich des Göttlichen, des Unvergänglichen; ohne sie, ins Reich des Niedrigen, Verschwindenden, Gemeinen. So gewiss es etwas Wahres, Schönes und Gutes giebt; so gewiss giebt es einen Gott. Zu ihm führt alles, was über die Natur erhebt; der Geist des Gefühls; der Geist des Gedankens; unser inwendigstes Bewusstseyn. Sein Daseyn beruht uns nicht auf einem Wunsch; es ist das Sicherste und Gewisseste, aus dem unser eignes Daseyn hervorgieng: Unsterblichkeit beruht nicht auf einem müssigen Postulat; wir fühlen sie in unserm freyen Handeln und Wirken. Wir brauchen sie nicht zu erringen durch das Gute, weil sie uns mit demselben eigenthümlich angehört; wir können sie nur verlieren durch das Böse, und sie mit Kunst und List aus unsrer Erinnerung vertilgen. Freyes, unsterbliches Wesen, Mensch, Bruder, voll hoher Andacht, Hingebung, Liebe; wie kann der Buchstabe deiner philosophirenden Vernunft dich stärker lehren, was du im Allerheiligsten deiner Seele lebendiger glaubst, hoffest und weisst: Walten des Unendlichen über dir, Tugend aus Freyheit, und ewiges Leben! (p. 194)

This third note, like the second, can be traced back to the passage on pages 54-56 of Schelling's *Denkmal*, a part of which was paraphrased above. The last part should be quoted, in support of this contention:

Auch konnte die kantische Kritik ihres milderen Resultats ohnerachtet immer noch zur Bestätigung des Hauptsatzes gebraucht werden. Denn das Einzige, was Herrn Jacobi in diesem Betracht genirte, die praktischen Postulate, auf welche sie noch ihre Hoffnung in Ansehung übersinnlicher Ideen setzte, war für seine umstürzende Kraft eine Kleinigkeit. [Here the note, the passage from *Jacobi an Fichte* quoted above.] Auch sie konnte also benutzt werden, dem Zeitalter an's Herz zu legen, wie eben jeder neue wissenschaftliche Anlauf immer wieder auf Atheismus hinausführe.

This appears, in its various statements and implications, to explain why Coleridge was led to write as he did; and "seine umstürzende Kraft" gives point to the first sentence of the note which is otherwise pointless. His own full understanding of the matter under discussion, as given in the paragraph in the *Bio-*

*graphia Literaria* already quoted in part as a parallel with the first marginal note, made it impossible for him not to protest.

After speaking of Kant's analysis, "not of human nature *in toto*, but of the speculative intellect alone"; Coleridge continues:

Here, therefore, he was constrained to commence at the point of *reflection*, or natural consciousness; while in his *moral* system he was permitted to assume a higher ground (the autonomy of the will) as a postulate deducible from the unconditional command, or (in the technical language of his school) the categorical imperative, of the conscience. . . . In spite of his own declarations, I could never believe, that it was possible for him to have meant no more by his *Noumenon*, or Thing in itself, than his mere words express; or that in his own conception he confined the whole *plastic* power to the forms of the intellect, leaving for the external cause, for the *materiale* of our sensations, a matter without form, which is doubtless inconceivable. I entertained doubts likewise, whether, in his own mind, he even laid all the stress, which he appears to do, on the moral postulates.

With this in mind, the result of study and thought, and written only a short time before, Coleridge was righteously moved to indignation by what he found in Jacobi. And he was even more strongly moved to disgust by Schelling's cowardly silence, refusing to further the cause of truth, and by the inhumanity of his cruel remark.

The fourth note, on page 387, written like the others on an inserted slip, is, unfortunately, incomplete. It is, however, the most interesting one, in some respects, and the most important.

Here Schelling has right on his side. This is a most intolerant, inhuman, glory[?] *Dominum* Passage.—What? the Herculean[?] Intellect of Kant could deceive itself [illegible] and not the *ποινται* of Philosophy [illegible].

"Here Schelling has right on his side," gives the clue which leads directly to the *Denkmal*. "Here" refers to Section 8, of the *Vorläufige Erklärung* (page 16), where Schelling gives various excerpted statements from Jacobi's *Von den Göttlichen Dingen*, beginning with part of a sentence at the top of page 386:

Der Naturalist, welcher dogmatisch behauptet: alles sey Natur, und ausser und über der Natur sey nichts—

Such a one, says Jacobi, should not use language borrowed from theism, for the practice leads to deception; at this point quoting, in a footnote, a paragraph from Kant's *Denkmal* in which much the same view is taken, e. g.:

Ein poetisch mystischer Atheismus, der sich Religion nennt, ist des Philosophen unwürdig, und ein schädlicher Verführer, indem er dem Menschen das Bedürfniss der reinen Wahrheit selbst ablügt, um ihn durch Anschauungen zu beseligen, aus denen der erfinderische Witz machen kann, was er will.

Finally, to return to Schelling's *Denkmal*, Schelling concludes with a quotation from what is apparently the "glory Dominum passage," which grieves him especially because of its seemingly personal application:

Der Naturalist muss nie reden wollen auch von Gott und göttlichen Dingen, nicht von Freiheit, von sittlich Gutem und Bösem, von eigentlicher Moralität; denn nach seiner innersten Ueberzeugung sind diese Dinge nicht, und von ihnen redend sagt er, was er in Wahrheit nicht meint. Wer aber solches thut, der redet Lüge. (Jacobi, III, 387.)

Thus three of our marginalia show that Coleridge read the *Denkmal* with his copy of Jacobi close at hand and consulted it occasionally to peruse the quoted passages with their context. What he wrote in his copy of the *Denkmal* (*Works*, III, 709), unimpressed as he was by "all the superior airs" of Schelling, reaffirms his allegiance to Kant as does the present notation; together they remove all doubt as to the comparative merits, in Coleridge's sight, of Kant and Schelling. The quotation from Kant was not overlooked, and it may have played some part in the final rejection of both Schelling and Jacobi. At least, it prompted "πονηται."

The words, "Here Schelling has right on his side," carry the tone of a grudging admission against Coleridge's dearer wishes, which harmonizes with the burden of the second note, wherein he seems anxiously to seek a means of rationalizing Jacobi's remarks even in the face of the latter's "captious" spirit. Although it may be true, as Shedd says,<sup>10</sup> and recently reaffirmed by Winkelmann,<sup>11</sup> that "Coleridge had much in common with Jacobi"—but, if these notes mean anything, this was "coincidence" of feeling more than thought, and innocent of borrowing;<sup>12</sup> and although the notes seem to show that Coleridge felt that Jacobi is to be preferred to Schelling—perhaps because of the inborn, natural leaning of his heart towards the side of mysticism;<sup>13</sup> still he does

<sup>10</sup> Introductory Essay, *Coleridge's Works*, I, 26.

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, 129 f.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Shedd, *op. cit.*, 27.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Winkelmann, *op. cit.*, 21: "Seine innere Tendenz zu mystisch

not hesitate the more, apparently on purely rational grounds, heart not ruling head the least,<sup>14</sup> to consign both "ποιηταί (poets) of Philosophy" to the same limbo; the one for theological "positions . . . in their literal sense scandalous";<sup>15</sup> and the other for his *suprarational* theism. Kant, he of the "Herculean Intellect," is the one sure guide towards the solution of the troublesome theological and philosophical problems to which Coleridge devoted the thought and labor of so many years. There is no mistaking that. Does not this mean, then, that Coleridge by the time these notes were written had forsaken all false gods, had definitely turned away from the new "wild grafts" on Kant and also the "golden mists" of the reactionary Jacobi to the "founder of the Critical Philosophy," in the perusal of whose works, as Coleridge penned in the *Denkmal* itself, he breathed "the free air of Good Sense and Logical Understanding, with the light of Reason shining in it and through it?"

Brief and few as they are, these notes reflect thoughts and speculations of one of the world's great minds at a time of fruitfulness, the *Biographia* just finished and the *Friend* being given its final form; a time of trouble, of labor, and of quest, of groping

religiöser Philosophie." And Raysor, T. M., *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, I, p. xxxiii, n.: "His characteristic weakness for semi-mystical intuitionism."

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Winkelmann, *op. cit.*, 23 f., and an interesting comment by an anonymous writer ("D") in *The London and Westminster Review*, April, 1836, p. 37: "Finding no steadfast footing in philosophy, he [Coleridge] betook him to the sacred oracles. But he carried with him his old intellectual habits, and sought an independent ground in human reason for truths which his wiser countrymen receive with silent acquiescence, as beyond the present scope of our facilities. Metaphysics were revisited to find a demonstration for the Trinity, and Kant was made subservient to St. Athanasius."—Similarly, W. Hale White, "Coleridge on Spinoza," *Athenaeum*, May 22, 1897, p. 680. The reference to Jacobi in one of the marginalia in H. C. Robinson's copy of Spinoza antedates, probably, the present notes. White says "Between 1810 and 1820." But Coleridge borrowed a Spinoza from Robinson Nov. 3, 1812 (Raysor, *op. cit.*, II, 249).

<sup>15</sup> *Works*, III, 709. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 268, Sara Coleridge's note to Chap. IX. "It is certain that soon after the composition [N.B. not publication] of the B. L., he became dissatisfied with the system [of Schelling]. . . . He objected to it as essentially pantheistic. . . ."

S. T. C.'s note plainly shows his disillusionment with the "poet of Philosophy" who had long held him in thrall.

for the most elusive and most precious of all the things that men have sought. As we read these marginalia, written only for himself, it is like sharing, momentarily, Coleridge's struggles to find his way. They show a man, however vacillating and weak of will, yet of sound intellectual integrity. And it is, therefore, by no mere contingency that these notes confirm, and are confirmed by, Professor Muirhead's sympathetic and searching essay in the Coleridge Centenary Volume showing that the whole trend of S. T. C.'s metaphysical thought is in conflict with the way of mysticism represented by Jacobi. Our notes mark one more incident in the lifelong war waged in his own being, seeking to restrain and direct susceptibility of feeling—religious, artistic, what not—by some principle grounded in human reason,—“to make the reason spread light over our feelings, to make our feelings diffuse vital warmth through our reason.” How different in purport from Jacobi's “Geist des Gefühls,” which flatly rejects the guidance of reason,—“wie kann der Buchstabe deiner philosophirenden Vernunft dich stärker lehren, was du im Allerheiligsten deiner Seele lebendiger glaubst, hoffest und weisst!”<sup>16</sup>

JULIAN IRA LINDSAY

*University of Vermont*

---

<sup>16</sup> The problem of dating Coleridge's marginalia, so important and usually so difficult to solve (cf. Muirhead, *Coleridge as Philosopher*, p. 271 f.), arises in connection with these notes. (Cf. Winkelmann, *op. cit.*, 131.) It is pertinent to point out that Coleridge had Schelling's *Denkmal* put to his account on August 31, 1816. (Griggs, *Unpublished Letters of S. T. C.*, II, 175.) In the *Biographia Literaria*, written just the year before (Cf. Campbell, *Life*, pp. 212, 213 and note; and *B. L.* (1847), I, 275: “the present 1815”) “Coleridge speaks of Schelling's philosophy as if it had his entire approbation” (Sara Coleridge, Note to Chap. ix, *B. L.*, I, 276.) It would be only reasonable to expect Coleridge, because of his enthusiasm at that time, to turn to the *Denkmal* as soon as it was at hand. Then, the third volume of Jacobi's *Werke* was published in 1816, and we have seen that the two were read, in part at least, together. And in view of Coleridge's plain implication that before the end of 1817 (Letter to Dr. Green, Dec. 13, 1817, *Letters*, 1895, II, 683) he was well acquainted with the work of Jacobi, “a rhapsodist . . . all in small capitals,” there is reason to surmise, at least, that these notes were written sometime between August 31, 1816 and December 13, 1817. There is, however, impressive testimony for the establishment of a *terminus ad quem* in that all of Coleridge's references to and adaptations from Jacobi, except the one in



## LESSING AND BURNABY

The citations in Lessing's *Die aufgebrachte Tugend*, a fragmentary scenario, indicate that the sketch is based upon a play, although the specific work is not named. The source is an English piece called *The Modish Husband* (1702). This comedy and three others, all four of which were published anonymously, were by the same author (according to statements on the title pages of three of them) and were formerly ascribed to a Charles Burnaby, of whom nothing else is known; but F. E. Budd, in the Preface and the Introduction to his edition of *The Dramatic Works of William Burnaby* (London, 1931), presents a strong argument to the effect

B. L. already noted, appear in the *Friend* (Second edition, 1818), which was in preparation beginning in September, 1816, when Coleridge sought a copy of the first edition, not then in his possession, meaning to republish, with changes. (Griggs, II, 178.) On February 6, 1817, he wrote (Griggs, II, 192) that the first volume of the *Friend* "is nearly printed." He was too hopeful, for the first volume bears a note, pp. 264-265, initialed with the date "8 April, 1817," on the passage in which allusion is made to Jacobi, "a continental Philosopher." In the very next paragraph, p. 266, Coleridge writes, "I should have no objection to define Reason with Jacobi," etc. As he wrote on Jan. 5, 1818 (Griggs, II, 219), "I shall fag from tomorrow at the third volume of the *Friend*," the second volume must have already been finished. And in the second volume, as a motto (1818 ed. Essay IX, p. 216), is a long quotation from *Jacobi an Fichte* (*Werke*, III, 37), only five pages before the paragraph on which was written our second annotation. *And there are no other references to Jacobi elsewhere in Coleridge's published works.*

The dates agree perfectly: Coleridge acquired the *Denkmal* Aug. 31, 1816; Jacobi, II is dated 1815; III, 1816; he began to rewrite the *Friend* in the autumn of 1816, printing the first volume soon after "8 April, 1817," and finished the second volume before Jan. 5, 1818. We know that he read the *Denkmal* and his Jacobi together. The matter was fresh in mind and, of course, while the *Friend* was being recast ("in substance almost half is fresh matter," Griggs, II, 192) he incorporated whatever was pertinent to his argument. All in all there can be little doubt that these marginalia were written between Aug. 31, 1816 and Dec. 13, 1817; or more specifically, on the basis of the dated footnote in the *Friend* (I, 264-5), before "8 April, 1817." And Coleridge never mentions Jacobi again; he did not complete his set of Jacobi's *Werke*; search in that direction was futile, for he had rejected Jacobi completely. Instead of holding, as does Frh. Winkelmann (*op. cit.*, 145), that Coleridge's relation (*Verhältnis*) to Jacobi was of longer duration and deeper than that to Schelling,

that they were written by William Burnaby. *The Modish Husband* was not successful in its own day and was not reprinted till the above-mentioned edition of Budd in 1931.

The connection between *Die aufgebrachte Tugend* and *The Modish Husband* is too obvious to require much discussion. The Graf and the Gräfin of the German scenario correspond to Lord Promise and Lady Promise of the source, the Baron and the Baroness to Sir Lively Cringe and Lady Cringe, Amalia to Camilla, and Lionel to the character of the same name. The two plots, so far as Lessing's is sketched (four acts), are essentially the same:

*Die aufgebrachte Tugend*

The Graf, in order that he may not be disturbed in an amour with the Baroness, has induced Lionel, the lover of Amalia, to play the gallant to the Gräfin.

*The Modish Husband*

Lord Promise, in order that he may not be disturbed in an amour with Lady Cringe, has induced Lionel, the lover of Camilla, to play the gallant to Lady Promise.

I should prefer to believe that there was no important relation at all, and that even what knowledge he had of Jacobi was chiefly incidental to his one-time interest in Schelling and most casual.

On the seeming contradiction, "I should have no objection to define Reason with Jacobi . . . as an organ bearing the same relation to spiritual objects . . . as the eye bears to material and contingent phenomena," quoted above, v. Shedd, Coleridge's *Works*, II, 144 n.; Winkelmann, *op. cit.*, 130, 142; Muirhead, *Coleridge Studies by Several Hands*, p. 194. The crux is Coleridge's qualifying sentences: "But it must be added that it [reason, the 'inward eye'] is an organ identified with its appropriate objects. Thus God, the Soul, eternal Truth, &c. are the objects of Reason; but they are themselves *reason*." Distinguished authority supports the belief that this is of utmost importance and not to be put lightly aside. In James Marsh's copy of G. A. Gabler's *System der theoretischen Philosophie*, Erlangen, 1827, I B., S. 354, the following passage is heavily underscored: "So ist die Idee des Lebens, die Idee Gottes, der Natur, des Geistes, des Staates u. s. w. das Leben, Gott, Natur, Geist, Staat selbst, aber als Idee, eben weil sie den absoluten Begriff in sich hat und er selbst ist, auch nur im absoluten Wissen und Erkennen vorhanden, oder, was dasselbe heisst, die Idee kann in ihrer Wahrheit nur begriffen werden, nicht angeschaut, vorgestellt u. dgl." And in the margin Marsh wrote: "Coleridge's idea of reason or rational idea intuitively known according to his view." On the basis of this comment, the authoritativeness of which no one will question, it becomes doubly clear that Coleridge put himself on record as going much farther than Jacobi, as Shedd remarks. And therein lies a world of difference. Really there is no contradiction. Coleridge was consistent and the qualification expresses the essence of his "idea of reason."

*Die aufgebrachte Tugend*

"Der Graf ärgert sich über die Unempfindlichkeit des Barons, und das halbe Vergnügen scheint ihm weg zu fallen, weil dieser nicht eifersüchtig ist."<sup>1</sup>

Lionel becomes fascinated by the Baronesse. "Und indem er vor ihr niederfällt, kömmt der Graf dazu."

"Bey welcher Scene es die Gräfin in dem Cabinete erfährt, dass der Graf selbst den Lionel aufmuntert, seine Frau zu lieben." "In vollem Zorne." "Die Gräfin ist fest entschlossen, der Liebe des Lionel Gehör zu geben."

Amalia "sieht, dass sie die Tugend so vieler Personen gleichsam in ihren Händen hat, und ist fest entschlossen, sie alle, zu ihrem Besten, zu hintergehn."

All of Lessing's page references to his source, twelve in number, fit the 1702 edition of *The Modish Husband*. For instance, in Act II, scene v, Lessing has: "Die Gräfin. Lionel. / Siehe die erste Scene des 2ten Acts p. 15." In the English piece Act II begins on page 15 and opens with a passage between Lionel and Lady Promise (the Gräfin) that is appropriate for Lessing's scene. Again, in Act IV, scene iv, Lessing indicates that the letter from the Gräfin which Lionel is to read is on page 30. At the place cited, the proper letter is to be found.

In the scenes in which Lessing has citations, the source sheds light upon his intentions. The following is a list of his scenes containing references, the content of the respective passages of *The Modish Husband* being here given after the double dashes and the page citation at the end of each item referring to the 1702 edition:

*The Modish Husband*

Fanlove and Lionel remark that Sir Lively Cringe cannot be made jealous and that, consequently, the satisfaction of cuckolding him will be lessened. Later (Act IV; page 44 in the 1702 edition) Lord Promise himself wishes that Sir Lively were jealous.

Lionel becomes fascinated by Lady Cringe and, as he kneels before her, is surprised by Lord Promise.

Lady Promise, on overhearing that Lionel has been instructed by Lord Promise to make love to her, is angered so much that she resolves to encourage the attentions of the young man.

By means of deception (with the assistance of Lady Promise), Camilla straightens out the entanglement.

<sup>1</sup> In this article, quotations from *Die aufgebrachte Tugend* are based upon the Lachmann-Muncker edition of Lessing's works: *Sämtliche Schriften* (Stuttgart, 1886 ff.), III, 325-28.

I, i. "Siehe die erste Scene p. 1." -- Lady Promise (the Gräfin) complains that her husband has fallen in love with another woman. Camilla (Amalia) advises her to make him jealous, and Lady Promise replies that she has already taken the first step by entertaining Lionel. This young man surprised her with a declaration of love, which she rejected. She will not go beyond the bounds of honor. (Pp. 1-3)

I, iv. "Siehe p. 5." -- Lionel reports that Lady Promise received him "with Scorn and Indignation." He fears that, if he succeeds in arousing her interest, her honor will be in danger, but Lord Promise (the Graf) has confidence in Lionel's friendship to him and in her virtue. (Pp. 5-6)

II, i. "Siehe p. 11." -- Lord Promise tells Lady Cringe (the Baroness) about his having instructed Lionel to play the gallant to Lady Promise. He did not love his wife but married her because she was rich. (Pp. 11-12)

II, ii. "Siehe p. 13." -- Without suspecting the affair between Lady Cringe and Lord Promise, Sir Lively Cringe (the Baron), who has ambitions to become a great courtier, thanks Lord Promise with great ceremony for providing lodgings for him in Promise's apartment at court. (Pp. 13-14)

II, v. "Siehe die erste Scene des 2ten Acts p. 15." -- Lady Promise has induced Lionel to pay his addresses to Lady Cringe, although he protests that his real passion will always be for Lady Promise. (Pp. 15-16)

III, i. "Siehe p. 16." -- "To undermine this pretender to Virtue" (Lady Promise), Lady Cringe praises Lionel to Lady Promise. (P. 16)

III, ii. "Siehe p. 17." -- Lionel and Lady Cringe are fascinated by each other, and Lady Promise begins to feel jealous. (Pp. 17-20)

III, iii. "Siehe p. 26." -- After declaring on page 25 that he cares for only one woman, Lionel pretends to show Lady Cringe a picture of this person--and produces a mirror. (P. 26)

III, iv. "p. 26." -- Lady Cringe says that Lionel will explain and leaves. (Pp. 26-27)

III, v. "p. 27." -- Lionel gets out of the difficulty by saying that he has been thanking Lady Cringe for speaking a good word for him to Lady Promise. (P. 27)

III, vi. "In vollem Zorne. Siehe p. 28." -- "I'll see you shall be as good as your word, Husband! Virtue be gone! I'll hear no more thy Voice, but give a loose to my resentment! for what are Honour and Marriage Vows in competition with this injury!--but I'll preserve 'em, I'll obey this Husband! this Villian! this civil Adulterer! this accomplish'd Fop! I'll satisfy him fully! and am the veriest Ass my self--if I don't make him the greatest of all Mankind!" (P. 28)

IV, iv. "Lionel. / liest den Brief (p. 30) und macht seine Anmerkungen darüber." -- "(Reads) I perceive your Heart has not met with that difficulty in obeying my Commands, and that in refusing your addresses I have hinder'd you from being false: how happy it was that I did not listen to so much Treachery! (hum!) my Virtue that surmounted those

tryals will always be my defence. (Ha! ha!) but you are a Traytor, and I have advised you to nothing but what you wish'd for before. I have now a just sence of your attempts upon my Honour, and expect that you will instantly come and ask my Pardon.

*Promise*

Hum! ask her Pardon! if matters go on so fast I shall have too much Love upon my hands very quickly! now wou'd she have me go and beg pardon for injuring her Honour till I have left her none at all—(*humming over the Letter*) hum—ha—hum! " (Pp. 30-31)

Lessing evidently planned to introduce more comic material into *Die aufgebrachte Tugend* than has hitherto been supposed. He seems to have intended to take over at least Sir Lively Cringe's bowing and scraping (in II, ii), the incident of the mirror (in III, iii), and Lionel's embarrassment and subsequent explanation when Lord Promise finds him kneeling before Lady Cringe (in III, iii-v). Moreover, *The Modish Husband*—the plot of which, as we have seen, he followed rather closely—is a comedy of manners, and he probably would have borrowed some other comic material besides these three incidents.

Nevertheless, *Die aufgebrachte Tugend* appears to have been designed as a middle-class comedy (usually called *sentimental comedy* in English).<sup>2</sup> In the first place, *The Modish Husband* is not so cynical and coldly satirical as the typical Restoration comedy of manners; in fact, it has some "sentimental" touches. Lady Promise declares in Act I that she will not proceed beyond the bounds of honor in her relations with Lionel, Camilla cautions her against going too far, and Lord Promise has confidence in his wife's virtue. Lady Promise elicits some sympathy as a wronged wife, and Camilla as the devoted sweetheart of a fickle lover. The entanglements are removed without serious consequences: Lady Cringe loses interest in Lord Promise because of Lionel, Lionel is happily reclaimed by Camilla (through a deception on her part, to be sure, rather than an act of generosity), and Sir Lively is able to rejoice that he has escaped becoming a cuckold. In the second

<sup>2</sup> At about the time of sketching *Die aufgebrachte Tugend* (about 1753?), Lessing called middle-class comedy with comic elements the best type of comedy ("Abhandlungen von dem weinerlichen oder rührenden Lustspiele" [1754], Lachmann-Muncker, VI, 50-53). For the meaning of the term *middle-class comedy* as used in the present paper, see my "Lessing's Relation to Early English Sentimental Comedy," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 807-09.

place, the title and several notations of *Die aufgebrachte Tugend* suggest that Lessing intended to increase the importance of the moral purpose, the reformation of characters, and the happy ending. The Graf is troubled by his conscience (I, v); Lionel is worried that his feigned love for the Gräfin may jeopardize his true love for Amalia (I, iii); and Amalia, realizing that she has the virtue of so many people in her hands, undertakes to straighten out the complications (still through deception) for the benefit of all, although she admits that her strongest motive is her love for Lionel (IV, ii). In the third place, Lessing's scenario indicates that much of the comic material of *The Modish Husband*, such as the character of Harry, was to be omitted. In short, the dramatist apparently planned to produce a middle-class comedy with some comic elements.

To have his material conform strictly to the rules of the three dramatic unities, Lessing had to make various structural alterations. The action of *The Modish Husband* is already less complicated than that of most Restoration plays; but he simplified it further by omitting such incidents as the beating of Lord Promise by the servant of Sir Lively and the wooing and attempted serenading of Camilla by Harry. The scene of the source shifts back and forth among Lord Promise's rooms, Sir Lively's lodgings, and the garden (each act except the first containing at least two settings); but the scene of the scenario does not change within any of the four acts sketched, and the action of the whole play was evidently planned for one spot (presumably a room in the home of the Graf). In Burnaby's comedy several days are allowed for the action; but in *Die aufgebrachte Tugend*, though the duration of time is not indicated, the general impression is that unity of time was to be observed.

PAUL P. KIES

*State College of Washington*

---

#### DER HEXAMETER IN GOETHES *REINEKE FUCHS* UND *HERMANN UND DOROTHEA*

Johann Heinrich Voß wird sich wohl nicht haben vermuten lassen, daß er in einer Streitfrage von überjahrhundertjähriger Dauer das Wort ergriff, als er am 13. Juni 1794 an seine Frau

schrrieb: "Goethe bat mich, ihm die schlechten Hexameter anzumerken [im *Reineke Fuchs*]; ich muß sie ihm alle nennen, wenn ich aufrichtig sein will."

Ihm sowie den andern klassisch eingestellten Zeitgenossen, seinem Sohne, A. W. Schlegel, Wilhelm von Humboldt, waren diese Verse nicht griechisch genug. Im Banne einer quantitativen Versauffassung, ohne die bewußte Einsicht, daß im Deutschen der Akzent und die Melodie allein maßgebend sei, besserten sie daran herum, suchten Spondäen und einen gewichtigeren Gang der Verse zu Wege zu bringen, und Goethe unterwarf sich ihrem philologischen Urteil, bis er im vorgerückten Alter die Ehrfurcht vor dem wissenschaftlichen Wesen in der Verskunst abschüttelte. Später aber setzte die Kritik von der andern Seite her ein: die antiken Maße wurden als nicht eigentlich deutsch verdammt, als der deutschen Sprache sowohl wie dem deutschen Inhalt nicht gemäß. "Ein sonderbarer Einfall, den Reineke in Hexameter zu setzen," sagt schon Voß in demselben Briefe, ein Urteil das sich auch in bezug auf *Hermann und Dorothea* bis in unsere Literaturgeschichten hinein erhalten hat und noch von Burdach mit dem Ausdrucke "Erdenrest des klassizistischen Schulstaubes" wiederholt wird.

Unter dem Einflusse dieser Tradition haben auch die Metriker wenig Gutes über Goethes Hexameter zu berichten, und selbst Heusler (*Deutscher und antiker Vers*, Straßburg 1917) kann sich, nach einem würdigen Lobe von Goethes Leistung, nicht ganz versagen, den Knittelvers als dem Hexameter überlegen zu rühmen, obwohl ihn doch sogar der junge Goethe nicht als ausreichend empfunden hatte, wenn er im *Urfaust* Madrigalverse, Alexandriner und freie Rhythmen einmischte.

Dem Urteil, daß der Hexameter schwer zu lesen sei und ohne Kenntnis antiker Maße dem Uneigeweihten fremdbleiben müsse, dürfte jede Lehrerfahrung selbst mit nichtdeutschsprachlichen Schülern auch in wenig vorgerückten Klassen widersprechen. Voreingenommenheit hat hier also entschieden den Blick getrübt. Im metrischen Handwerk kommt dazu ein unglückliches Ausgehen von den Versfüßen; die einen finden sie zu schwer, die andern zu leicht, wie ja überhaupt der Daktylus ein sehr problematischer Patient der Orthopäden geblieben ist. Heusler in seiner vorzüglichen Studie ist so erfüllt von heiligem Zorn über den bösen Spondäus, daß er trotz aller Vorsicht und dank seiner prinzipiellen

Ablehnung melodischer Werte zuweilen Schwierigkeiten findet, wo im Grunde keine vorhanden sind. Köster in seinem Aufsätze über *Deutsche Daktylen* (Zfda 46, 113-127) rühmt zwar, daß Goethe den Hexameter "so für seine Zwecke zu modeln wußte, daß im Grunde zwei verschiedene Versmaße daraus wurden," glaubt indessen dieser Verschiedenheit dadurch nahe kommen zu können, daß er echte und unechte Daktylen scheidet und darüber wichtigere Faktoren übersieht.

Nach ihm gibt es:

- A: echte (dreizeitige) deutsche Daktylen des Typus  $\dot{\text{J}}. \text{J} \dot{\text{J}}$  mit hüpfendem, beschleunigtem Tempo und
- B: unechte (zweizeitige) Daktylen,  $\dot{\text{J}} \dot{\text{J}} \text{J}$ , die dem antiken Trochäus nahestehen und feierlicher, schwerer sind.

Seine Statistiken sind zwar verführend, aber wie wenig mit der Scheidung in Fußtypen erreicht ist, zeigt das Beispiel, das er selber anführt, Schillers *Geschlechter*, in dem gerade die echten Daktylen Schwere und die unechten Leichtigkeit zeigen:

- B. Scheu wie das zitternde Reh, das ihr Horn durch die Wälder verfolgt,  
Flieht sie im Manne den Feind, hasset noch, weil sie nicht liebt.
- A. Trotzig schauet und kühn aus finstern Wimpern der Jüngling,  
Und gehärtet zum Kampf spannet die Sehne er an.

Das Prinzip der Silbenschwere, das immerhin eine Teilrolle spielen mag, wird nämlich oft von so vielen andern Faktoren des Rhythmus durchkreuzt, daß es völlig illusorisch werden kann. Der Dichter mag unbewußt durch den Zwang des betreffenden Sprechstiles, Material des einen oder andern Typus bevorzugen, bewußt hier und da sogar nachhelfen und nachbessern, aber vom Versfuße her kommen wir der Behandlung eines Maßes nicht nahe, wir müssen vom Prinzip des eigentlich rhythmischen Flusses her, von der höchsten Einheit, dem Ethos, zur niedersten fortschreiten und die Gesamtwirkung aller Elemente und ihrer gegenseitigen Beziehung betrachten. So ist es denn erklärlich, daß in der ganzen Diskussion über die verschiedene Behandlung des Hexameters durch Goethe die ohrenfälligsten Merkmale übersehen sind.

Beginnen wir mit dem Handgreiflichsten an diesen Vortragsstilen: der leichte, naive, etwas märchenhafte, plaudernde, schelmische Stil des *Reineke Fuchs* bevorzugt einfachste Syntax, kurze Sätze, naive Rhetorik, starke Akzente einer der Alltagssprache



angenäherten Redeweise, sprüchwörtlichen Ausdruck, naturalistische Charakterisierung der Sprechart jeder Person. Der würdige Hexameter wird mit heiterer Ironie diesem Zwecke anbequemt, er wird zerstückelt, er wiegt sich im Plaudertone, er wird an Anfang und Ende vor- oder rückverbunden, seine ursprüngliche Einheit verliert sich, neue, kleinere Einheiten entstehen, der Rhythmus wechselt, er verweilt, eilt, pausiert, beschleunigt sich von neuem. Der dem älteren deutschen Sprechvers so eigentümliche Hakenstil entsteht, d. h. eine starke Neigung zum Übergreifen des Satzes von einer Reihe zur andern.

Eine Untersuchung der beiden Epen auf das Enjambement hin ergab das Verhältnis von 31.5% (*Reineke Fuchs*) zu 19% (*Hermann und Dorothea*). Wie sich im einzelnen die Verhältnisse gestalten, erläutert die unten beigefügte Tabelle. Es verschieben sich danach die Verhältnisse so, daß für R. F. im ersten der beiden verbundenen Verse die kürzeren abgetrennten Versteile überwiegen (R. F. : H. u. D. = 23 : 20; 50 : 30; 25 : 40; 3 : 4; 0 : 7), im zweiten Verse wenigstens der Einschnitt nach der dritten oder dem ganzen Verse in H. u. D. das Übergewicht hat.

Es wurden untersucht von R. F. je 200 Anfangsverse der 12 Gesänge (= 2400 Verse), in H. u. D. je 200 Anfangsverse der Gesänge I, II, IV-VII, je 100 Anfangsverse von III und VIII, die an sich kurz sind, und 300 Anfangsverse von IX (= 1700 Verse). Dabei zeigte sich ein Schwanken des Enjambements von 11-26% in H. u. D. und von 25-38% in R. F. für die einzelnen Gesänge.

Im Verhältnis zur Gesamtzahl des Enjambements in den betreffenden Epen verhielten sich die abgetrennten und miteinander verbundenen Teile ihrer Länge nach wie folgt (die Prozentzahlen sind abgerundet):

Im ersten der beiden verbundenen Verse:

Silbengruppe mit	1 Akzent	2 Akzenten	3 Akzenten	4 Akzenten	5 Akzenten	6 Akzenten
R. F. ....	23%	50%	25%	3%	..	..
H. u. D. ....	20%	30%	40%	4%	..	7%

Im zweiten der beiden verbundenen Verse:

R. F. ....	8%	33%	44%	10%	..	1.4%
H. u. D. ....	14%	23%	55%	3.5%	..	4%

Beispiele:

*Reineke Fuchs*, I, 53-56

Akzente (die erste Zahl gilt für die Akzentgruppe, die vom ersten Verse abgetrennt wird, die zweite für die mit ihr verbundene des folgenden Verses)

3 + 3 Jagen war ich gegangen; / auf meinem Wege durchsucht' ich

- 1 + 2 Eine Mühle zur Nacht; / es schlief die Müllerin; / sachte  
 2 + 3 Nahm ich ein Würstchen, / ich will es gestehn; / doch hatte zu dieser  
 Wackerlos irgend ein Recht, / so dankt' er's meiner Bemühung.

*Hermann und Dorothea*, IX, 50-54

- 2 + 6 Beiden wird Leben zum Tod. / Der Vater mit Unrecht  
 Hat dem empfindlichen Knaben den Tod im Tode gewiesen.  
 3 + 1 Zeige man doch dem Jüngling / des edel reifenden Alters  
 3 + 2 Wert, / und dem Alter die Jugend, / daß beide des ewigen Kreises  
 Sich erfreuen / und so sich Leben im Leben vollende.

Das Verhältnis der Akzentgruppenbindung in beiden Epen spiegelt sich in folgenden Prozentzahlen:

	1 + 2 Akzente	2 + 2 Akzente	2 + 3 Akzente	3 + 2 Akzente	3 + 3 Akzente
R. F. ....	12%	16%	22.5%	9.5%	11%
H. u. D. ..	10%	7.7%	17%	10%	26%

Alle übrigen Gruppen stehen hinter diesen an Zahl weit zurück. H. u. D. hat verhältnismäßig die größere Variation und neigt zu längeren Teilen auch mit ungebrochenen Sechsern, die im *Reineke* nicht vorkommen. Nur eine vollständige Tabelle würde dies klar zum Ausdruck bringen. Eigentümlich ist in beiden Epen, daß dieselben Gruppenbindungen oft zwei oder drei mal hintereinander auftreten. Die *Achilleis* geht noch über H. u. D. hinaus in der für dies letztere Werk charakteristischen Richtung.

Es nehmen also in *Hermann und Dorothea* die längeren Teile verhältnismäßig zu, was dem getragenen, ruhigeren, gemütlichen Pathos des bürgerlichen Idylls durchaus entspricht, das in längeren Perioden dahingleitet, syntaktisch unterordnet und mit Partizipialkonstruktionen und gehäuften Adjektiven dem Stile Homers angeglichen ist. Sein gehaltenes Legato steht dem kapriziösen Staccato des *Reineke* gegenüber, ist auch sonst mit tieferer Stimmlage von ihm unterschieden.

Die Tonführung in *Hermann und Dorothea* ist einfach, sie bleibt auf längere Strecken, über Gruppen mit 2, 3, 4 Akzenten auf derselben Höhenlage, gewöhnlich erst hoch, fällt dann zu einer zweiten, kürzeren und schließt mit Kadenz. In Frage- und Aufzählungsspannung (siehe das zweite Beispiel) kehren sich die Verhältnisse um:

H. D. I, 1.

Hab' ich den Markt und die Straßen doch nie so einsam gesehen!  
Ist doch die Stadt wie gekehrt! Wie ausgestorben! Nicht funzig  
Deucht mir, blieben zurück von allen unsern Bewohnern.

Was die Neugier nicht tut! So rennt und läuft nun ein jeder,  
Um den traurigen Zug der armen Vertriebnen zu sehen.

H. D. iv, 8.

Da durchschritt sie behende die langen doppelten Höfe,  
Ließ die Ställe zurück und die wohlgezimmerten Scheunen,  
Trat in den Garten, der weit bis an die Mauern des Städtchens  
Reichte, schritt ihn hindurch und freute sich jeglichen Wachstums,  
Stellte die Stützen zurecht, auf denen beladen die Aeste  
Ruhten des Apfelbaums, wie des Birnbaums lastende Zweige,  
Nahm gleich einige Raupen vom kräftig strotzenden Kohl weg;  
Denn ein geschäftiges Weib tut keine Schritte vergebens.

Trotz dieser Bindung durch Tonniveau auf längere Strecken sind die Akzente durchaus monopodisch, d. h. selbständig und gleichgeordnet, unabgestuft. Sie werden also nicht untereinander verglichen sondern mit den Senkungen. Diese fallen nun entweder, bei Tieflage der Gruppe, gewöhnlich ab, indem die erste (wenn wir zwei Senkungen haben) nahe der Tonhöhe der Hebung bleibt, die zweite gewöhnlich zur Indifferenzlage absinkt. Bei Hochliegen des Niveaus erhebt sich die erste gewöhnlich noch etwas über die Lage der Akzentsilbe, die zweite sinkt ab oder leitet über. Ist die Senkung einsilbig, so nimmt sie die tiefere Stufe, falls sie nicht durch Frage oder Erwartungsspannung in die Höhe gezogen wird:

Hab' ich den Markt und die Straßen doch nie so einsam gesehen

\* . \* . \* . \* . \* . \*

Ließ die Ställe zurück und die wohlgezimmerten Scheunen

\* . \* . \* . \* . \*

Der Hexameter in *Hermann und Dorothea* ist demnach monopodisch, unabgestuft, mit gleichmäßig dynamischen Akzenten, melodisch ruhig, mit langen Tonstrecken, längeren Perioden, ruhigem Tempo und verhältnismäßig gewichtigem Wortmaterial, wenn auch die Kritik nicht unberechtigt ist, daß besonders die Versanfänge oder die Akzentstellen nach starkem Schnitt (wie übrigens oft bei andern Goethischen Metren) nicht selten reichlich leicht akzentuiert sind (Heusler S. 121). Aber die Erhöhung der

sprachlich leichten Silbe in der Hebung sowie die Drückung der sprachlich schweren Silbe in der Senkung gehören in den Stil dieses getragenen Verses und erzeugen ein Spannungsverhältnis zwischen dem Stramin des Metrums und dem darübergewobenen Rhythmus, das beabsichtigt ist und nicht ohne weiteres verurteilt werden darf. So darf denn auch der ganz anders geartete Rhythmus des *Reineke Fuchs* nicht dagegen ausgespielt werden.

Im *Reineke* haben wir als hervorstechendes Merkmal einen ausgesprochen abgestuften Vers von vornehmlich dipodischer oder tripodischer Bindung. Die Melodie schießt im Zickzack auf und ab, denn die Akzente sind in erster Linie durch Hoch- oder Tieflage gegeneinander kontrastiert. Es entstehen also durch die Beziehung dieser Hoch- und Tiefpunkte und der zwischen ihnen liegenden Schnitte gewöhnlich dipodische oder tripodische Gruppen dieser Art:

Dipodien mit Parallelbewegung:<sup>1</sup>

R. F. 2. Fēld und Wāld; / auf Hügeln und Höhn, / in Büschen und Hecken

55. Nāhm ein Würstchen, / ich will es gestēhen; / doch hatte zu diesem

Dipodien mit Parallel- und Gegenbewegung:

15. Līcht und Tag, / es schēute der Fuchs / die versāmmelten Herren

9. Lūtke der Krānich, / und Markart der Hāher, / und ālle die Besten

Dipodien mit dreifacher Gegenbewegung:

5. Fēstlich heiter / glānzte der Hīmmel / und fārbig die Erde

222. Dēren Schuld / er lēider bekenne. / Da habe nun kēiner

Tripodien mit Parallelbewegung:

3. Übten ein fröhliches Līed / die nēu ermunterten Vōgel

51. Schon sind Jāhre vorbeī, / seit diese Hāndel geschehen

Tripodien mit Gegenbewegung:

17. Ālle hatten zu klāgen, / er hatte sie ālle beleidigt

10. Denn der Kōnig gedēnkt / mit āllen seinen Baronen

Der dipodische Typus hat seine Entsprechung in Goethes Knittelvers:

<sup>1</sup> Die Verse müssen natürlich immer im betreffenden Zusammenhange gelesen werden.

Satyros 16.

Ich sah im Frühling ohne Zahl  
Blüten und Knospen durch Berg und Tal,  
Wie alles drängt und alles treibt,  
Kein Pläcklein ohne Keimlein bleibt.

Der tripodische dagegen in Goethes Alexandriner:  
Die Laune des Verliebten:

7. Ich weiß es ganz gewiß, / du liebst nur mich allein  
51. Den Vogel, den du liebst / als Nebenbuhler haßt  
214. Wie mächtig zu dem Streit / er durch die Liebe war  
188. Nicht ihre Liebe rührt, / dich rühret nicht ihr Schmerz

Da also im *Reineke* der Iktus, d. h. die über die andern Hebungen sowie die Senkungen ausgezeichnete Akzentsilbe den Vers beherrscht, haben die unbetonten Silben als dritte und daher kaum hörbare Stufe, die auch an Dauer sehr gekürzt wird, also im beschleunigten Tempo sehr wenig zur Geltung kommt, fast gar keine Bedeutung. Daraus erhellt, wie verkehrt es ist, diese Silben mit denen der unabgestuften Monopodieen von *Hermann und Dorothea* zu vergleichen und aus ihrer Wägung den Unterschied des Metrums erklären zu wollen. Es wäre also auch verkehrt, hier von echten Daktylen im Gegensatz zu Trochäen zu sprechen. Wenn Köster den Vers im *Reineke* hüpfend nennt, so stimmt das durchaus. Damit ist aber doch eigentlich schon zugegeben, daß wir hier dann nicht von Walzertakt reden können, dessen Art in ruhigem Schleifen besteht.

Zusammenfassend und erweiternd können wir also folgende Gegensätze der beiden Verse aufstellen:

	<i>Reineke Fuchs:</i>	<i>Hermann und Dorothea:</i>
Bindung:	Hakenstil	wenig Enjambement
Versschnitte:	kurze Gruppen	lange Gruppen
Spannung:	locker	gestrafft
Stimmelage:	hoch	tief
Stimmfärbung:	hart	weich
Tonführung:	gezackt	eben und lang
	pointiert	getragen
Kontrastlagen:	Iktus-Nebenhebung	Hebung-Senkung
Akzent:	abgestuft	nicht abgestuft
Gruppenbildung:	tripodisch oder dipodisch	monopodisch
Tempo:	schnell	gehalten

A FRENCH ADAPTATION OF *SANDFORD AND MERTON*

In December 1783, Arnaud Berquin, who was already well known for his two volumes of *Idylles*, his *Choix de Tableaux anglais*, his *Romances* and his *Ami des Enfants*,<sup>1</sup> announced that he planned to devote his occasional moments of leisure to the adaptation of juvenile literature from English sources.<sup>2</sup> The unusual success of his *Ami des Enfants* spurred him on to continue his work in that field. That Berquin should have drawn upon English literature for suitable material is natural enough as he was quite familiar with its works. He had already borrowed his *Choix de Tableaux anglais*<sup>3</sup> from English periodical literature and two poems of his *Romances*<sup>4</sup> from English lyric poetry. Moreover, we know from an entry in Fanny Burney's diary that he had been in England in the summer of 1783.<sup>5</sup> It is also possible that when Berquin made the above announcement he was referring to the translation of *Sandford and Merton*, written by Thomas Day and published in three parts, in 1783, 1786, and 1789.<sup>6</sup> Although we

<sup>1</sup> The *Idylles* appeared in 1774 and 1775, the *Choix de Tableaux anglais* in 1775, the *Romances* in 1776, and the *Ami des Enfants* in twenty-four monthly installments throughout 1782 and 1783.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Ami des Enfants*, December, 1783, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my study, *Berquin's Adaptations from English Periodical Literature*, *PQ.*, **xiii** (1934), 248-260.

<sup>4</sup> *L'Hermite*, *Œuvres complètes de Berquin*, édition Levacher & Prieur, 1802, **viii**, 108 ff., is an adaptation of Goldsmith's *Hermit*. *La funeste vengeance de la jalousie*, *op. cit.*, 114 ff., is a translation of *The Spanish Virgin; or the Effects of Jealousy*, found in Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*.

<sup>5</sup> *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay*, edited by her niece, **ii**, 1781-1786, London, 1842, 272. The entry devoted to Berquin is dated Sunday, July 6, 1783.

<sup>6</sup> *The History of Sandford and Merton. A work intended for the use of children*. London. Printed for John Stockdale, opposite Burlington-House. Piccadilly. **i**, 1783; **ii**, 1786; **iii**, 1789. The book tells the story of two children, one poor and the other rich, who are brought up by a clergyman, Dr. Barlowe, away from their parents. Tommy Merton, son of a wealthy family, has been spoiled by the adulation of his mother and the servants. Harry Sandford, son of a peasant, has always lived near nature and has remained honest and upright. Careful and patient work on the part of Dr. Barlowe and the example set by Harry are to bring Tommy back into the right path.

have no statement to that effect, it is not unreasonable to assume that he became acquainted with this work during his stay in London and that he may even have met its author.

Thomas Day was a humanitarian with definite, if not always very practical, ideas on education.<sup>7</sup> Early in life, he retired to his country estates and there practised philanthropy among the peasants. He was an ardent admirer of Rousseau's *Émile*. In 1769 he wrote to his friend Edgeworth that, if all books were to be destroyed, he would want an exception to be made in favor of the Bible and the *Émile*.<sup>8</sup>

*Sandford and Merton* represents an important stage in the history of juvenile literature, since it is the first example in England of the moral tale with all its essential characteristics. The work met with immediate success and was one of the most popular children's books of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thomas Day became known as the author of *Sandford and Merton* just as Berquin's name became inseparable from his *Ami des Enfants*. The method followed by the author is quite typical of the times. The moralizing vein is relentless; the discussions are endless. Pride, sensuality, idleness, insubordination, and cruelty are censured, while the happiness of quiet and simple life, the beauty of work and charity are extolled. Fortunately, the moral lessons are interspersed with scientific information. In this connection, one might point out that, as far as cosmography and physics are concerned, Day has reproduced most of the experiments found in Book III of the *Émile*. But his admiration for Rousseau does not lead him to adopt the theory of negative education advanced by the French reformer. The preceptor always appeals to reason and argues so well and with such impeccable logic that the youth must surrender.

It is quite easy to see why Berquin became so much interested in

<sup>7</sup> The following works contain a study of Thomas Day's life and works: James Keir, F.R.S., *An Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Day*, London, 1791; John Fyvie, *Literary Eccentrics*, London, 1906, 37-64, *The Author of Sandford and Merton*; J. Pons, *L'éducation en Angleterre entre 1750 et 1800. Aperçu sur l'influence pédagogique de J.-J. Rousseau en Angleterre*, Paris, 1919, 39 ff.; Sir Michael E. Sadler, *Thomas Day, An English Disciple of Rousseau*, Cambridge, 1928; George W. Gignilliat, Jr., *The Author of Sandford and Merton. A Life of Thomas Day, Esq.*, New York, 1932.

<sup>8</sup> Maria Edgeworth, *Memoirs of Richard Lovell Edgeworth begun by himself and concluded by his daughter*, London, 1821, 2nd edition, I, 226.

*Sandford and Merton*. This book advocated ideas which were very dear to his heart, love of simple life, superiority of country over city, virtue and innocence of the poor, compassion for the unfortunate. Its philosophy harmonized very well with his social and educational views as already expounded in *L'Ami des Enfants*. He used only the first two parts of the English original, and his version came out in seven installments in 1786-1787.<sup>9</sup> The critic of the *Mercure de France*,<sup>10</sup> in an article devoted to the French translation, stated that Berquin would translate the succeeding parts as soon as they appeared in English. However, the work was left unfinished, for he did not translate the third volume of the original, published in 1789.

*Sandford and Merton* is permeated in places with a strong evangelical spirit. Berquin entertained no animosity against any specific religious belief, as is evident from his works, but always restricted himself to natural ethics as expounded by Rousseau and his followers, and consistently avoided all reference to particular cults. Day devotes a page to a discussion of the exemplary life of moderation and virtue led by the Apostles.<sup>11</sup> This passage is eliminated in Berquin's adaptation. More important and more significant, however, is the complete omission of Dr. Barlowe's nine-page exposition of the merits of true Christian ethics.<sup>12</sup> The translator, like all *philosophes*, shuns the very name of God, who is referred to as the Supreme Being or the Creator. At times Berquin simply drops the references to God and to Christ. There are several instances of this practice in the French adaptation of *Sandford and Merton*.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> F. J. Harvey Darton in his treatment of children's books in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (London, XI, 1933 ed., note at bottom of p. 424) states that *Sandford and Merton* was translated into French—probably by Berquin—in an *VI de la République*, 1798. The writer seems to forget that Berquin had died seven years previous to that date.

<sup>10</sup> May 5, 1787, 27-35.

<sup>11</sup> I, 7. All the references to *Sandford and Merton* in this study are to the Rivington edition, 2 vols., London, 1820. In Berquin's translation, the corresponding passage would have come on p. 382 of Vol. VIII of the *Oeuvres complètes*.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 12-21.

<sup>13</sup> For instance, Day mentions the name of God, I, 44, Berquin does not in the corresponding passage, VIII, 435; on page 52 of volume one, the



Several passages which have no connection with religion have also been dropped entirely. Day uses the fable of *The Flies and the Ants*<sup>14</sup> to illustrate a certain point of ethics. Berquin omits it in his translation. He has not chosen, either, to relate the sad adventure of the monkey who lights the cannon and is blown into a thousand pieces.<sup>15</sup> He has left out, likewise, Day's story about the telescope.<sup>16</sup> Berquin is more cautious and less outspoken than Day in his statements concerning the upper classes. For instance, in the English original, Mr. Merton, in the course of a conversation with his wife about Sandford's rustic manners, declares that the ease of manners of which the aristocracy is so proud is unimportant and represents only a superficial culture.<sup>17</sup> On the next page, the preceptor exposes the prejudices of the nobility against the other classes.<sup>18</sup> These two passages are not to be found in Berquin's adaptation.

These are the most important changes made to bring *Sandford and Merton* closer to French taste. Berquin has striven to adapt the work to deism and to soften the spirit of criticism against aristocracy without weakening thereby his pleas against social iniquities. Humanitarianism is just as pronounced in Berquin as in Day, but it is more sober because he is opposed to violent social revolutions. Pons' statement that Berquin has made a *berquinade*<sup>19</sup> out of a book of pedagogy and social criticism is exaggerated and unfair.

The French version of *Sandford and Merton* met with considerable success in France. The *Mercure de France* kept its reader informed of the progress of the translation and devoted to it a long and very favorable study in its number of May 5, 1782.<sup>20</sup> The anonymous critic found the character of the preceptor very well depicted and was very much impressed by his method of teaching

English original refers to Christ, the French version drops that reference in VIII, 452; on page 159, Day speaks of the Gospel and of Jesus Christ, Berquin does not in IX, 223.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 23-26.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 219-225.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-12.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, note at bottom of pp. 192-193.

<sup>20</sup> Pp. 27-35.

the two boys the elements of arithmetic and natural science. The only point to which he objected was that Day had made Henry Sandford too mature for his age:

La seule objection critique que nous aient fourni les deux élèves, c'est que l'Auteur, pour avoir trop donné à Henri & d'instruction & de sagesse, semble lui avoir ôté un peu des grâces de son âge. C'est une perfection trop précoce qui le fait estimer & qui le fait paraître un peu moins aimable.<sup>21</sup>

*Sanford and Merton* was read quite widely by French youth in the nineteenth century, both in Berquin's translation<sup>22</sup> and in the English text. It was on the program of English courses in the lycées until around 1900. The catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale lists five different school editions of this work between 1875 and 1887.<sup>23</sup>

J.-M. CARRIÈRE

*Northwestern University*

---

### A SMOLLETT LETTER

The following letter is not included in Dr. Edward Noyes's edition,<sup>1</sup> nor has it, as far as I have been able to discover, appeared in any generally available form elsewhere. The facsimile copy in the

<sup>21</sup> P. 33.

<sup>22</sup> Berquin's adaptation of *Sanford and Merton* had numerous editions in the nineteenth century. The Bibliothèque Nationale has on its shelves editions published in 1821, 1825, 1842, 1847, 1851, 1852, 1864, 1865, 1868, 1874, 1877, 1880, 1882. It was also included in the editions of Berquin's complete works that appeared in 1802, 1803, 1829, 1829-1830, 1835, 1836, and 1843. A Spanish translation came out in 1835 under the title *Sanford y Merton, historia moral compuesta por los niños por Berquin según Thomas Day*, Paris, 4 vols.

<sup>23</sup> *Sanford et Merton*, par Thomas Day, édition classique précédée d'une notice littéraire par E. Sedley, Delalain, 1875 and 1880; *Sanford et Merton* (extraits), texte anglais, revu et annoté par M. l'abbé Delrieu, Poussielgue frères, 1885 and 1903; *Sanford et Merton*, édition classique précédée d'une notice littéraire par A. Elwall, Delalain 1886 and 1892; *The History of Sanford and Merton*, by Thomas Day. Édition abrégée avec notes par L. G. Rosenzweig, A. Fourault, 1886; *Cours de langue anglaise . . . Les auteurs du programme . . . Thomas Day, Sanford et Merton*, par A.-A. Liégaux-Wood., classe de septième, Delagrave, 1887.

<sup>1</sup> *The Letters of Tobias Smollett*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1926.

New York Public Library collection of manuscripts is taken from a catalogue issued by the American Art Association for a sale held January 16-17, 1930. The catalogue note accompanying the letter states that it was "almost certainly addressed to Temple Henry Crocker or William Huggins, who published a translation of 'Orlando Furioso' in 1755." The letter is described as "inlaid and bound in a first edition of Smollett's translation of Don Quixote, 1755, London." The text is as follows:

Dear Sir,

I send my Spaniard to return the compliment I have received by your Italian. Cervantes was a warm Admirer of Ariosto, and therefore Don Quixote cannot be disagreeable [sic] to a Lover of Orlando furioso [sic]. Though I do not pretend to compare my Prose with your Poetry, I beg you will accept of my Translation, as a mark of that Perfect Esteem with which I have the Honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedt. and humble servt

Ts. Smollett

Chelsea Dec. 7, 1756

CLAUDE JONES

*Syracuse University*

#### ANOTHER FEMININE ANSWER TO CHATEAUBRIAND'S SLIGHTING REMARKS MADE ABOUT VENICE IN 1806

Scholars have paid considerable attention to the disturbance that Chateaubriand's depreciatory remarks about Venice, written on the occasion of his first visit to that city and published in the *Mercure de France*<sup>1</sup> of August 16, 1806, created in Italian literary and social circles.<sup>2</sup> Recently, M. René Dollot, French Consul

<sup>1</sup> *Mercure de France*, xxv (1806), 314-15. Easily accessible in *Correspondance Générale de Chateaubriand*, I, 221-23.

<sup>2</sup> The following chronological bibliography will show the attention that this incident has received: G. Moschini, *Della Letteratura Veneziana del Secolo XVIII* . . . , Venezia, Palese, 1806, III, 105-06; V. Malamani, *Isabella Teotochi Albrizzi* . . . , Torino, Locatelli, 1882, p. 118; Alessandro Luzio, *Lettere inedite di Giustina Renier Michiel all'abate Saverio Bettinelli*, Ancona, Morelli, 1884, p. 9; V. Malamani, *I Francesi a Venezia e la Satira*, Venezia, Merlo, 1887, p. 193; Ch. Dejob, *Mme de Staël et l'Italie* . . . , Paris, Colin, 1890, p. 77; P. G. Molmenti, *Venezia nell'arte e nella lette-*

General at Trieste, in an excellent article entitled *Chateaubriand à Venise et à Trieste*,<sup>3</sup> reviewed this entire question. In his very able manner he also commented upon and reproduced the replies of the two Italian ladies, known thus far, who took exception to the French poet's statements and who led the attack in vindicating Venetian pride, namely: Countess Giustina Renier Michiel and Marchioness Orintia Romagnoli Sacrati. The Countess, in French, and in aristocratically measured terms, refuted<sup>4</sup> Chateaubriand's contentions that Venice is "une ville contre nature," with streets as narrow as corridors, and black gondolas reminding one of funeral coffins, etc.; while the Marchioness, in untempered phrases, referred to the author of the *Génie* as delirious: "Per altro come mai si può rispondere al delirio di un uomo? Se uno dicesse che il Sole è un corpo emanatore di tenebre, chi vorrebbe contraddirlo?"<sup>5</sup>

*ratura francese*, in "Archivio veneto," XXXVII (1907), 312; P. Hazard, *La Révolution française et les lettres italiennes (1789-1815)*, Paris, Hachette, 1910, p. 267; G. Rabizzani, *Chateaubriand*, Lanciano, Carabba, 1910, p. 223-31; Guido Mazzoni, *Ottocento*, Milan, Vallardi, 1913, I, 136; G. Gambarin, *Per la fortuna di alcuni scrittori stranieri nel Veneto . . .*, Venezia, A spese della R. Deputazione, 1914, p. 10-11; Garabed Der-Sahaghian, *Chateaubriand en Orient*, Venise, Saint-Lazare, 1914, p. 50-52; Gabriel Faure, *Les six voyages de Chateaubriand en Italie*, in *R. D. M.*, LXXXV année, 6me pér., t. 28 (1915), 867; Lucien Cattan, *La Venise de Byron et la Venise des Romantiques Français*, in *R. L. C.*, V (1925), 100; T. Napione, *Studi sulla fortuna di Chateaubriand nella letteratura e nell'arte italiana . . .*, Torino, Paravia, 1928, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Correspondant*, CI (1929), 400-24.

<sup>4</sup> The refutation bears the title: *Réponse à la lettre de Mr de Chateaubriand sur Venise*; it was anonymously published in the *Giornale dell'Italiana letteratura*, Padova, XIV (1806), 260-67. The popular acclaim with which this reply was received is attested to by the several editions mentioned by M. Dollot, p. 405-06, n. 4.

<sup>5</sup> The answer of Orintia Romagnoli Sacrati was published in pamphlet form under the title: *Lettera di Fiordiligi Taumanzia Pastorella d'Arcadia all'ornatissimo signore Floriano Caldani Bolognese. P. Professore di anatomia nella R. Università di Padova*. The first edition—with which M. Dollot is acquainted only through G. Soranzo's *Bibliografia Veneziana*, Venezia, Naratovich, 1885, p. 192—was published at Padua, Penada, 1807. It is composed of 15 pp. 8°, and is found at the Royal University Library at Padua: Busta 219-23. The second edition—with the indication *Dall'Autrice emendata e riorretta*, Venezia, Vitarelli, 1807, 14 pp. 8°—which M. Dollot used, offers very minor changes of wording and punctuation. Copies of this edition are found at the Marciana (Misc. 2160, no. 3) and

I should like to add, by way of a note to M. Dollot's study, a third answer to Chateaubriand's statements also written by a feminine hand and which, so far as I am aware, has never been mentioned. The following passage from a letter of Melchior Cesarotti addressed to a certain Sign. Ca. Livia Dragoni gave me the clue to the existence of this third document:

Certo che la sua bontà perdona alle mie incessanti e spesso tediose occupazioni la tardanza delle mie risposte, suppongo che in cambio delle scuse, ella amerà meglio di sentire qual impressione m'abbia fatto il suo scritto sul giudizio di Chateaubriand intorno Venezia. E esso mi riuscì gratissimo, e piacevolissimo avendolo trovato ingegnoso, d'un tornio originale, delicato, e nobile. Chateaubriand è uno di quei pochi autori ch'io prediligo e che formano la mia biblioteca del cuore. Perciò mi spiace assai ch'egli siasi lasciato scapper dalla penna quei tratti di negligente disprezzo sopra una città, che sotto vari aspetti potea meritare tutt' altro, e pareva forse degna del suo entusiasmo.\*

Professor Oliviero Ronchi, Director of the Museo Civico of Padua, was kind enough to identify for me Livia Dragoni as Lavinia Florio Dragoni Contessa d'Udine; and Professor B. Cornagli, librarian of the Biblioteca Comunale "Vincenzo Joppi" at

at the library indicated above, at Padua. (Busta 339-2). I found an advertising poster for this pamphlet preserved at the British Museum [11840 i 44(2)] which helps to show the interest taken in the controversy at Venice and which I beg to reproduce:

#### AVVISO

Per Giovedì 21 Maggio 1807 verso il Mezzogiorno.

È sortita dai torchj del Penada in Padova una nuova risposta apologetica alla Lettera del Sig. de Chateaubriand, più estesa, e categorica della prima, di Fiordiligi Taumanzia Pastorella d'Arcadia diretta al Sig. Floriano Caldani P. Professore d'Anatomia in quell' Università. Non avendo bastato il discreto numero degli esemplari colà impressi a saziare la ben giusta curiosità, che una sì giudiziosa operetta ha svegliato nel Pubblico, è condiscesa l'umanissima Autrice, onde soddisfare alle molte ricerche, che se ne fanno, a permetterne in Venezia la ristampa da qualche tipografica menda espurgata, e non senza qualche piccola modificazione di alcuni termini corsi inavvedutamente in quell'affrettata edizione.

Sarà vendibile questa seconda al tenue prezzo di soldi 10. italiani corrispondenti a una lira veneta in circa ne' seguenti ricapiti:

Dal Librajò Bertazzoni sotto le Procuratie Vecchie. There follows a list of the cafés and drug stores where the pamphlet could be obtained.

\* *Opere dell'Abate Melchior Cesarotti Padovano*, Pisa, Presso Niccolò Capurro, 1813, xxxix, 55. The letter bears neither indication of place nor date.

Udine, very obligingly sent me the following biographical information from the Florio genealogical record: Lavinia, daughter of the poet Daniele Florio, was born in 1745; she married in 1766 Count Antonio Dragoni, and died in 1811. Attempts, however, to find her "scritto sul giudizio di Chateaubriand" in northern Italy were unsuccessful. Good fortune led me to its discovery in the British Museum.<sup>7</sup>

Lavinia Dragoni's answer<sup>8</sup> to Chateaubriand is in French verse. It possesses neither the serious quality of Giustina Renier Michiel's attempt at vindication nor the rancor of Orintia Sacрати's protest. Sixty-one years of age and several years the senior of her Italian sisters, the Contessa d'Udine seems to have learned to remain unruffled in the face of presumptuous statements made by temperamental poets, and her sense of humor stands her in good stead. She senses acutely the two weaknesses of the French writer: vanity and susceptibility to the fair sex. With these two failings in mind, she cajoles Chateaubriand and in light vein puts him in his place. As this brochure adds another document toward the reconstruction of the account of Chateaubriand's first and tempestuous visit to Venice, and because of its extreme rarity, I have thought it worth while to reproduce it here.

#### A Mr CHATEAUBRIAND

*Sur ce qu'il a dit de Venise dans sa lettre imprimée dans le Mercure  
du 16 octobre (sic) 1806*

A Venise on vous réimprime,  
Vous voyez que dans cet état,  
Le bon goût règne et que l'on vous estime,  
Et vous en parlez mal, c'est être bien ingrat.  
Venise est donc contre nature;  
L'auteur d'Emile avait abusé de ces mots;  
Faut-il qu'un chef marquant de la littérature  
S'en serve encore hors de propos?

<sup>7</sup> 11840. i. 44(4).

<sup>8</sup> In pamphlet form of 8 pp. 8°, without indication of pagination. The place of publication is indicated on the last page as follows: Venise, Chez François Andreola Imprimeur à S. Ange. No date is given. The pamphlet begins with an extract from Chateaubriand's letter as inserted in the number of the *Mercure de France* already mentioned, and is followed by the poem which I reproduce.

Au siècle cinq, un peuple avec courage,  
 Fuyant l'esclavage et la mort,  
 Présents accoutumés des barbares du Nord,  
 Va s'établir sur un étroit rivage,  
 Avec fureur attaqué par les flots;  
 Il les contient par d'immenses travaux:  
 Ce peuple défendu par la mer asservie,  
 Avec son nom conserve sa patrie;  
 Dans la guerre il a des héros,  
 Et l'on vante son industrie.  
 Son existence, dira-t-on,  
 Contre les eaux, c'est l'art seul qui l'assure;  
 Mais l'art fut-il jamais contre nature?  
 Il en est l'imitation:  
 Vous l'avouerez. Suivons votre censure.  
 De nos gondoles la couleur  
 N'a pas non plus le bonheur de vous plaire:  
 Le politique et le chrétien austère  
 Vont être ici son défenseur.  
 Dans le temps de la République,  
 Le luxe de Venise était solide et grand;  
 Ce qui ne durait pas, se faisait simplement;  
 Mais de rares tableaux, avec le marbre antique,  
 Des murs de ses palais, faisaient seuls l'ornement.  
 Pour la gondole indispensable,  
 Le noir de tous fut adopté:  
 C'est le seul point d'ailleurs, où ce peuple estimable  
 Avait pu conserver l'esprit d'égalité.  
 Combien ce choix aux bons chrétiens dut plaire;  
 Ce genre de voiture avait quelque danger:  
 Il offrait à l'amour l'asile du mystère;  
 La chair est faible et pouvait succomber.  
 Si le son d'une cloche à la plus tendre amante,  
 Des réprouvés fit éviter le sort;  
 Ici le noir lugubre, image de la mort,  
 Y fait penser, et rend la vertu triomphante.  
*Au poison près, on imite Atala;*  
 Est-il exemple en tout plus beau que celui-là?  
 Vous affirmer, pourtant je n'ose,  
 Que comme elle toujours chacun ait résisté;  
 Mais à coup sûr plus grand le péril eût été,  
 En remplaçant le noir par la couleur de rose,  
 Je suis sûr qu'à présent vous êtes pour le noir,  
 Et je poursuis. Vous vouliez des antiques,  
 Vous aurait-on caché ces gros lions attiques, (a)

a. Il existe à la porte de l'Arsenal deux Lions qui se trouvaient autrefois à (sic) Pirée d'Athènes.

Que près de l'Arsenal le curieux va voir?  
De Lafontaine invoquant le génie,  
Que ne les avez-vous un instant fait parler  
Sur cette nation polie,  
Que la vôtre aujourd'hui semble nous rappeler?  
Vous les auriez aussi mis sur le paganisme;  
Sur cet objet peut-être, on aurait à présent  
Un ouvrage de vous et léger et savant  
Comme celui sur le Christianisme.  
Mais du moins l'on n'a pu dérober à vos yeux,  
De nos couvents, l'effet délicieux:  
De nos peintres vous avez vu l'ouvrage,  
Leurs tableaux aussi ont eu vos suffrages.  
Dites-nous franchement, en voyant réunis  
Dans le même salon Jupiter, Osiris,  
Hercule avec Sanson, Vénus et Madeleine,  
Et le bon Saint Antoine auprès d'une Sirène  
N'avez-vous pas fait des réflexions,  
Je ne dis point philosophiques,  
Car ce grand mot n'a plus d'acceptions,  
Mais je dirai mélancoliques,  
Sur les changements d'ici bas,  
Sur les graves sujets de nos bruyants débats:  
On en ferait à moins. . . Je reviens à Venise:  
Par vous, sans ses tableaux, et ses nombreux couvents  
Sa réputation était bien compromise,  
Mais de la bien juger, vous n'eûtes pas le temps:  
Revenez-y; vous aimez les antiques?  
Je vous en promets plus que vous n'en voudrez voir.  
Une gondole rôtie ira vous recevoir,  
On l'ornera de franges magnifiques;  
Le chantre d'Atala n'a pas besoin de noir.  
Vous connaîtrez les dames de Venise;  
De leurs appas vous aurez l'âme éprise;  
Peut-être aussi vous leur plairez;  
Et bientôt retractant une injuste censure,  
Publiquement vous conviendrez,  
Que rien ici n'est fait contre nature.

EMILE MALAKIS

*University of Pennsylvania*

---



## CHATEAUBRIAND SE MÉPREND-IL SUR AVRAMIOTTI?

*Contribution aux études des procédés littéraires de Chateaubriand*

Chateaubriand a enregistré le souvenir personnel de sa visite à Argos en caractérisant le médecin du nom d'Avramiotti dont il avait été l'hôte le 20 août 1806. On se souvient comment il raconte dans l'*Itinéraire*<sup>1</sup> que ce docteur était Italien, qu'il avait fait sa fortune en Grèce et qu'il soupirait après son pays—Venise. Mais, à ce qu'il semble, le pèlerin se serait trompé de nationalité. Car, quand parut l'*Itinéraire* en 1811, le Grec, Avramiotti, se jugea offensé par cette méprise du poète et décida de se venger.

Par ces assertions hardies, je ne sais si je dois l'appeler davantage menteur, ou insolent. Moi désirer Venise, Venise ma patrie? Je suis Grec de religion et de nationalité et j'habite la Grèce,

se récria-t-il. Ce fut l'origine de son libelle, *Alcuni cenni critici sul viaggio in Grecia di Chateaubriand*,<sup>2</sup> écrit en italien et publié à Padoue en 1816.

Quoique Garabed der-Sahaghian, le plus sérieux critique du voyage en Orient, en se basant sur les assertions du médecin, ait avancé l'opinion que "l'imagination de Chateaubriand invente aussi des personnages ou plutôt les transforme jusqu'à les rendre méconnaissables,"<sup>3</sup> il m'a toujours semblé que la parole de Chateaubriand valait bien celle d'Avramiotti, et qu'il fallait sortir de l'obscur labyrinthe des hypothèses avant de révoquer en doute le récit du voyageur.

Pour le passage en question d'ailleurs, le problème de savoir si le poète rédige avec toute l'exactitude désirable n'est pas compliqué. Il ne s'agirait que de rechercher des documents biographiques sur Avramiotti. Aussi attendait-on beaucoup, avant de la lire, de la petite thèse de Mlle Poirier, *Les notes critiques d'Avramiotti sur le voyage en Grèce de Chateaubriand*.<sup>4</sup> Mlle Poirier ne déçoit pas

<sup>1</sup> *Itinéraire* (éd. Ladvocat), VIII, 111.

<sup>2</sup> *Alcuni cenni critici del dottore Gian-Dionisio Avramiotti sul viaggio in Grecia che compone la prima parte dell' Itinerario da Parigi a Gerusalemme del Signor F. A. De Chateaubriand con varie osservazioni sulla antichità greche*. Padova, Tipografia Bettoni, 1816, 155 p., 8°.

<sup>3</sup> P. Garabed der-Sahaghian, *Chateaubriand en Orient*, Venise, 1914, p. 416.

<sup>4</sup> Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1929. J'aimerais ajouter

tout à fait. Son étude est bien nuancée et l'on y trouve le relevé minutieux des fluctuations de la critique à l'égard du médecin argien. Pourtant nous n'avons pas ici l'ouvrage définitif que l'on rêvait. Car, malgré ses efforts dignes d'éloges, Mlle Poirier n'a rien trouvé sur l'auteur lui-même. Or le problème de savoir si Chateaubriand se trompe à l'égard d'Avramiotti reste sans solution. Le portrait d'Avramiotti est-il méconnaissable? Laissons les documents biographiques—que j'ai eu la bonne fortune de découvrir à Athènes et que j'abrège pour ne relever que l'essentiel—nous donner les faits.<sup>5</sup>

Jean Denys Avramiotti naquit en 1770 à Zante—possession vénitienne jusqu'au traité de Campo-Formio en 1797. Il fit des études de lettres et de médecine à Padoue, et ensuite revint dans son pays pour exercer sa profession. En 1802, Jean Denys fut appelé par Moustapha, pacha de Tripoli en Morée, pour guérir sa fille. Il y resta quelques années avant d'aller demeurer à Argos. Vers 1811 Avramiotti alla s'établir à Athènes. Il y aida à fonder la Société des Philomuses. Il mourut dans cette ville en 1835. Ajoutons qu'Avramiotti n'entendait pas le français.<sup>6</sup>

Confrontons maintenant ces données précises avec le récit de Chateaubriand:

Je fus reçu à Argos par le médecin italien Avramiotti . . . M. Avramiotti avoit fait sa fortune, et il commençoit à soupirer après l'Italie . . . Nous parlâmes donc de la France et de l'Italie à Argos, par la même raison que le soldat argien qui suivoit Enée, se souvint d'Argos en mourant en Italie . . . M. Avramiotti me montrait un promontoir de l'autre côté de la mer, et me disoit: "C'étoit là que Clytemnestre avoit placé l'esclave qui devoit donner le signal du retour de la flotte des Grecs"; et il ajoutoit "Vous venez de Venise à présent? Je crois que je ferois bien de retourner à Venise."<sup>7</sup>

---

aux quatre exemplaires de la brochure d'Avramiotti que connaît Mlle Poirier les suivants: Venise, Musée Correr (cote G 339); Bibliothèque Nationale d'Athènes (cote ΓII 8, et ΓII 8<sup>a</sup>); British Museum (cote 10126 bb. 27).

<sup>5</sup> Nicolas Katrame, *Recueils littéraires* (en grec), Zante, 1880, p. 445; P. Chiotis, *Mémoires historiques des Sept-Iles* (en grec), Zante, 1887, pp. 288-90; Léonidas Ch. Zoe, *Dictionnaire littéraire et historique de Zante* (en grec), Zante, 1898, I, 4. De plus une biographie assez importante dans la Grande Encyclopédie Grecque sous le nom d'Avramiotti.

<sup>6</sup> Comte Joseph d'Estournel, *Journal d'un voyage en Orient*, Paris, Crapelet, 1844, I, 113.

<sup>7</sup> *Itinéraire*, loc. cit.

Nos documents n'aident-ils pas à confirmer ce souvenir poétique de l'entrevue à Argos? Le texte ne s'explique-t-il pas? Le poète qui rédigeait trois ans après son voyage, n'était-il pas excusable s'il se méprenait sur la nationalité de l'ancien étudiant en médecine de Padoue qui était né dans une possession vénitienne et avec lequel il n'aurait pu s'entretenir qu'en italien? Ne semble-t-il pas naturel aussi qu'on ait parlé de la France et de l'Italie à Argos sinon "pour la même raison que le soldat argien qui suivait Enée, se souvint d'Argos en mourant en Italie" au moins certainement parce que Chateaubriand arrivait de Venise et qu'Avramiotti avait passé les plus belles années de sa vie en Vénétie? Et qui sait, mon Dieu, si en présence du poète nostalgique, le médecin d'Argos n'a pas exprimé un vif désir de revoir le pays où il avait fait ses études—ce qui a donné: "Vous venez de Venise à présent? Je crois que je ferais bien de retourner à Venise."

Serait-il trop catégorique de dire, en conclusion, que le récit de Chateaubriand doit être sincère et exact? Nous trouvons d'ailleurs l'aveu de cette sincérité dans un compte-rendu qu'a consacré l'auteur des *Martyrs* au Voyage de Forbin; le passage servira de réplique à Avramiotti:

M. le comte de Forbin nous apprend encore, au sujet d'Athènes, que le docteur Avramiotti a écrit une brochure contre nous . . . Nous ignorons ce que nous avons fait au docteur Avramiotti: nous le citons dans l'*Itinéraire* avec toute sorte de considération . . . Nous sommes donc aujourd'hui la fable et la risée d'Argos? Nous tâcherons de nous en consoler, en songeant que depuis le temps de Clytemnestre on a tenu bien de mauvais propos dans cette ville.<sup>8</sup>

EMILE MALAKIS

*University of Pennsylvania*

#### FOUR OF POE'S CRITIQUES IN THE BALTIMORE NEWSPAPERS

Several months before his leaving Baltimore in the latter part of July, 1835, Edgar Allan Poe began contributing tales and book reviews to *The Southern Literary Messenger*, a monthly literary magazine which had been founded in August, 1834, by Thomas Willis White, a printer of Richmond, Virginia, assisted by James

<sup>8</sup> *Le Conservateur*, III (1819), 388-9.

Ewell Heath, the first state auditor of Virginia. Not only was Poe a contributor, but he was also a friendly literary adviser, suggesting changes in the magazine and offering his services without payment to increase the circulation of the journal, particularly by writing notices of the issues in the Baltimore newspapers.

In a letter to White, dated at Baltimore, May 30, 1835, Poe wrote:

My notice of your [April, 1835] *Messenger* in the *Republican* was I am afraid too brief for your views.<sup>1</sup> But I could command no greater space in its editorial columns. I have often wondered at your preferring to insert such notices in the *Republican*.<sup>2</sup> It is a paper by no means in the hands of the first people here. Would not the American suit as well?<sup>3</sup> Its columns are equally at your service. Did you notice the alteration I made in the name of the authority of the lines to Mr. Wilde?<sup>4</sup> They were written by Mrs. Dr. Buckler of this city—not Buckley.<sup>5</sup>

Thirteen days later, on June 12, 1835, Poe again wrote White, this time that he had entirely recovered from an illness, "although Dr. Buckler no longer than 3 weeks ago, assured me that nothing but a sea-voyage would save me," and he promised:

I will send you on the American<sup>6</sup> & Republican<sup>7</sup> as soon as the *critiques*

<sup>1</sup> The notice appeared in *The Baltimore Republican and Commercial Advertiser* (hereinafter cited as the *Republican*) for Thursday, May 14, 1835, and has been previously identified by Professor Killis Campbell, "Gleanings in the Bibliography of Poe," *MLN.*, xxxii (1917), 269.

<sup>2</sup> At this time the *Republican* was edited by Samuel Harker, a notice of whose death appeared in *The Baltimore American*, Monday, Nov. 18, 1850. See a brief mention of Harker in John H. Hewitt, *Shadows on the Wall, A Retrospect of the Past Fifty Years* (Baltimore, 1877), 20.

<sup>3</sup> *The Baltimore American* was edited by William Bose (1796-1875). See *The Maryland Historical Magazine*, xxxviii (1933), 1.

<sup>4</sup> "Answer to 'My Life Is like the Summer Rose,'" *Messenger*, i (1835), 452, was incorrectly attributed to "Mrs. Buckley, the wife of a distinguished physician of Baltimore." Richard Henry Wilde's "My Life Is like the Summer Rose" had appeared in the *Messenger*, i (1834), 13. The poem by Mrs. Eliza Sloan Buckler (1793-1863), wife of Dr. John Buckler (1795-1866), was copied in *The Baltimore American*, Wednesday, May 20, 1835. The lines by Wilde and Mrs. Buckler had previously appeared in *The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer*, Monday, Aug. 22, 1823.

<sup>5</sup> James A. Harrison (ed.), *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*. Va. Edition (New York, 1902), xvii, 6.

<sup>6</sup> *The Baltimore American*, Monday, June 15, 1835. In "A Few Notes on Poe," *MLN.*, xxxv (1920), 374, Professor T. O. Mabbott attributed this notice to Poe. See also Professor Mabbott's review of Charles F. Heartman

come out. What I can do farther to aid the circulation of your Magazine I will gladly do — but I must insist on your not sending me any remuneration for services of this nature. They are a pleasure to me & no trouble whatever.<sup>8</sup>

These critiques are here reprinted for the first time.<sup>9</sup> Unlike most of the notices of the *Messenger* by other reviewers who were given to "puffing," Poe's critiques are informative, critical, and prophetic of his later career. In them he evinces his first appreciation of the work of P. P. Cooke;<sup>10</sup> he shows a lively interest in the critical department of the magazine, which he later expanded under his own editorship; and finally he expresses an already partly formed idea of what a magazine should be. "A Tale of a Nose," in the April, 1835, number, which Poe found "well told" and "exceedingly ludicrous," perhaps furnished him with suggestions for his work on "nosology," "Lion-izing—A Tale." As will be remembered, "Lion-izing" was published in the *Messenger* for May, 1835.

## [1]

## THE SOUTHERN LITERARY MESSENGER.

The eighth number of this Magazine will make its appearance immediately. We have seen a copy of it in sheets, and have no hesitation in pronouncing it *equal*, at all events, to any thing of this kind in the country. Its character is now established upon a basis sufficiently sure, and we have

---

and Kenneth Rede's *Bibliographical Check-List of Poe in American Literature*, vi (1934), 94.

<sup>7</sup> The *Republican*, Saturday, June 13, 1835. This notice was copied in *The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer*, Tuesday, June 16, 1835. A notice of the tenth number of the *Messenger*, which was certainly written by Poe, appeared in the *Republican*, Friday, July 10, 1835. Two favorable notices of the *Messenger*, which I think were not Poe's, were published in *The Athenæum and Young Men's Paper*, eds. John N. McJilton and T. S. Arthur, i (July 11, 1835), 271, and i (Sept. 19, 1835), 351.

<sup>8</sup> Harrison, *op. cit.*, xvii, 7.

<sup>9</sup> It is a pleasure here to acknowledge my indebtedness and appreciation to Mr. Louis H. Dielman, Executive Secretary and Librarian of the Peabody Institute, Baltimore, for his generous assistance in helping me locate the notices in the *Republican*, a file of which from March, 1835, to March, 1836, is in the collection of the Maryland Historical Society. A long run of the *American* may be found in the same library and in that of the Peabody Institute.

<sup>10</sup> Philip Pendleton Cooke (1816-1850), an older brother of John Esten Cooke, the Virginian novelist, was the author of the essays on English poetry, "Rosalie Lee," and "The Last Indian."

no longer any doubts of its entire success. It is indeed a subject of general congratulation that the South has at length aroused herself from her lethargy in these matters, and ventured to erect a periodical literature of her own.

The eighth number, like the seventh, is a manifest improvement upon its predecessors. The volume, too, is almost entirely made up of original matter, there being only two very short selections. These things speak well for the energy of its conductor. We are sorry that an extended notice of the various articles in the Magazine would be out of place in a daily paper—but there are some which, from their high character, we cannot pass over in silence. Among these, Professor Tucker's *Discourse on the Progress of Philosophy* will elicit much attention. It is, in every respect, an able and valuable paper. The *Essay on English Poetry*, Chapter 1., is not only well written, but evinces a thorough knowledge of the subject, and altogether an erudition of no common order. We shall look for the ensuing chapters with eagerness. The fifth *Letter from N. England* is excellent: and the *Tale of a Nose* is well told, to say no more, and exceedingly ludicrous.

A striking feature in this Magazine, and one which cannot be too highly recommended, is the variety of critical notices of New Works: embracing nearly all of any consequence which have appeared in this country since the publication of the last number.

Of the Poetry we cannot speak altogether so favourably. Some of the pieces are exceedingly insipid; but the greater part are far above mediocrity. A few are admirable. Such lines as the *Apostrophe of the Æolian Harp* would alone give a character to any Magazine. They are beautiful indeed, and yet simplicity is their greatest charm. There is no clue to detect the author, but we verily believe they were written by the same hand which composed *Rosalie Lee*. Although the two poems are widely different, the same almost imperceptible quaintness runs throughout them both. Some passages in the *Last Indian* are fine—but as a whole we do not like it. Its great fault is obscurity. We will conclude this notice (in which we have already exceeded our limits) by transcribing some lines by Mrs. Buckler of this city, for which we are sure of being pardoned by all who can appreciate the delicate and beautiful. They are in reply to the popular lines of Mr. Wilde.

[The three stanzas follow.]

[2]

The ninth number of the *Southern Literary Messenger* has just reached us, and is upon the whole the best yet issued. It is the first made up entirely of original articles: we hope that in no future numbers will resort be had to selections: this dependence is allowable in the infancy of a periodical, but when it has grown up to vigorous strength, as the Messenger now has, it should rely upon its own resources.

Readers might be satisfied that they had their money's worth, if that be a consideration,—if they read but one article in this number, the dissertation on the "Characteristic differences between the Sexes." The subject

is of course of the richest, and it is treated with power and beauty. There is a continuation of the interesting "Tripolitan Sketches." We are pleased to note a spirited contribution from our townsman Edgar A. Poe, Esq. It is an *extravaganza* called "Lionizing," and gives evidence of high powers of fancy and humor. The writer of the article on "Recent American Novels," is, we think, wrong throughout, as well in his general opinions as in his particular commendation of "The Insurgents." Among the literary notices is a good one of "Horse Shoe Robinson," a work for which the public are eagerly looking, and for which we venture to predict universal popularity.

## [3]

## THE SOUTHERN LITERARY MESSENGER.

The ninth number of this Periodical is received, and contains even more than its usual quantity of excellent matter. We are glad to see also that this matter is, in the present instance, *entirely original*. There is not a selected article in the book. The outward appearance and typography is [*sic*] unexceptionable, and in no respect has the South occasion to regret the enthusiasm with which she has lent her aid to the support of the Messenger. We will endeavour to find room for a running notice of some of the principal articles in the present number. The sixth of the *Tripolitan Sketches* sustains the reputation of the preceding papers. The *Letters of a Sister* are also very spirited, vivacious, and well written. The third number of the *Fine Arts*, evinces a just application of the subject; and, in many respects, is excellent. The Article on *Recent American Novels* is crude and undigested.—The writer is evidently unacquainted with his theme.—This opinion of "The Insurgents" is exaggerated, and he has forgotten the talented novels of Mr. Kennedy & Dr. Bird in his wholesale denunciations. The *Dissertation on the Characteristic Differences between the Sexes* is a paper of unusual value. The subject is treated in a manner really masterly, and would be sufficient of itself to give a character to any Periodical. *Lionizing*, a tale by Edgar A. Poe, is an admirable piece of burlesque, which displays much reading, a lively humor, and an ability to afford amusement or instruction, according to the direction he may choose to give to his pen, which should not be suffered to lie unemployed, and will not, we trust, be neglected.

There are also some excellent sketches of *Virginia Scenery* viz: *The House Mountain visit to the Virginia Springs*, *Dagger's Springs*, and *The Red Sulphur Springs*. We refer our readers confidently to the *Critical Notices* in the present Number. We have read with interest the remarks on the *Promessi Sposi* of Mauzoni [*sic*]; on Mrs. Butler's Journal; and on our townsman Mr. Kennedy's new novel, Horse-Shoe Robinson—of which latter the publication, although long anxiously expected, has been, for what reason we know not, deferred. The poetical pieces are all above mediocrity. The lines to "*My Child*" are admirable; and we have seldom seen any thing of the kind more beautiful than "*My Native Land*," by Lucy T. Johnson.

## [41]

SOUTHERN LITERARY MESSENGER.—The tenth No. is received and sustains the already high reputation of the Periodical. Its contents, like those of No. 9, are entirely original, and, generally speaking, excellent. The *Storm on the Prairies* is a graphic sketch. Nos. 15 and 16 of *Letters of a Sister* are spirited and elegant even beyond the former Letters. In *Lionel Granby* we perceive a quiet strength which will enable the writer to do something better than he is at present doing. A cautious purity of style is not the least recommendation of these chapters. *Oliver Oldschool* has much humour, but is somewhat over zealous. We do not agree with the editor of the Messenger in his opinion of the Tale called *the Sandfords*. We think this little story exceedingly well told—although its commencement is irrelevant. The plot is simple but of great interest. We should never have suspected the piece to have been written by so young a person—for diffuseness and a want of simplicity are prevailing foibles of the young. We see no traces of either in the Sandfords. Chapter 2d, on *English Poetry*, is admirable. The writer has a fine feeling for the beauties of his subject, which is handled throughout in a novel and really masterly manner. *Hans Phaal, a Tale, by Edgar A. Poe*, is a capital burlesque upon balloonings, which has *recently* been carried to a ridiculous extent, without much prospect of *profit* to the persons engaged in it, or advantage to the community. *The Sale by Nugator* is graphically sketched, but its vulgarity of tone and language is especially to be censured. The Literary Notices are, as usual, excellent. We cannot too highly praise the Review of *Bankcroft's* [sic] *History* and that of *Washington's Writings*. The Poetical Department is, in general, good. The *Daughter's Lullaby* is truly beautiful, and we have no hesitation in saying that it far surpasses, the fine verses, in the same manner, by the lamented Mrs. Hemans. We do not, however, like the *Old Parish Church, by Nugator*. The hop, skip, and jump metre, whose grotesque air is heightened by means of double rhymes, is, to say the least, little in accordance with the solemnity of the subject. Some of the words are even misspelt, and not a few of the allusions are exceedingly low. The following versé is an exemplification of all three of these charges:

“*E'en* soldiers here beneath this roof  
Have held their midnight orgies,  
And without hath tramped the charger's hoof  
*Till the grave well nigh disgorges.*”

We repeat that the number, as a whole, is admirable. The Messenger improves rapidly, and bids fair to rival, if not to surpass the Knickerbocker itself.

DAVID K. JACKSON

*Duke University*

---



## THE 1876 ENGLISH SUBSCRIPTION FOR WHITMAN

One of the most heartening episodes in the history of Anglo-American literary relations is the English subscription for the Centennial Edition of *Leaves of Grass* and *Two Rivulets*, conducted in 1876 with astonishing financial success by a number of the poet's admirers, principally W. M. Rossetti and Robert Buchanan. It has been assumed that this particular subscription<sup>1</sup> was the result of an article in *The West Jersey Press* for January 26, 1876, which may have been written by Whitman himself.<sup>2</sup>

However, on September 27, 1875, W. M. Rossetti wrote to Mrs. Anne Gilchrist:

I don't know whether you ever see the review named The Academy. I write in it, & have in two or three instances inserted the latest news I had received of Whitman. The last—not favourable, & not extremely unfavourable—was 6 or 7 weeks ago perhaps. I then received the impression that Wh's position in money-matters is far other than it shd. be, & that we in England ought to see about it—(I remember you raised this question with me a couple of years or so ago).<sup>3</sup>

He also mentioned that Edward Dowden had written to him in regard to financial aid for Whitman and stated that should active steps be necessary he had thought of buying up a "large number or whole edition" of Whitman's poems and presenting them to public libraries "all over the civilized world, excluding the United States."

It is apparent, accordingly, that the plan to aid Whitman by subscribing for his books was in English minds before the *West Jersey Press* article ever appeared. Indeed, Rossetti states in the letter quoted above that he had already mentioned the plan to a number of people, who "highly approved" of it.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, it is clear that Mrs. Gilchrist, in the generosity of her love and enthusiasm for the paralyzed American, was the first to suggest the

<sup>1</sup> There was another in 1885-1886, which has received comparatively little notice. Cf. *Letters of W. M. Rossetti to Anne Gilchrist and Her Son*, ed. Clarence Gohdes and Paull F. Baum, Durham, N. C., 1934.

<sup>2</sup> Harold Blodgett, *Walt Whitman in England*, Ithaca, N. Y., 1934, p. 36 and C. J. Furness, *Walt Whitman's Workshop*, Cambridge, Mass., 1928, pp. 245 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters of W. M. Rossetti to Anne Gilchrist*, pp. 94-95.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

matter of English aid in his poverty. So far as is known, the suggestion was made in a letter to Rossetti of August 28, 1873:

I am afraid the friend you saw in the Spring [R. J. Hinton] gave you too sanguine an account of Mr. Whitman. . . . I cannot help thinking anxiously whether he has all the comforts he ought to have, and whether he is able to keep his Government appointment; and, if not, whether his poems bring him in anything like an adequate income; and wishing and wishing, for once in my life, that my means were not so scanty but that I could join with others who admire and love him to put our gratitude into some substantial shape that might free him from office-routine, even if he be able to resume it.<sup>5</sup>

Further light is shed on Mrs. Gilchrist's efforts to help Whitman by the following excerpt from her letter to Rossetti dated October 1, 1875, which possibly is a reply to Rossetti's letter quoted above:

I have had it so much on my mind that those who understand what Mr. Whitman really is, what he has accomplished for the present and the future, owe it not more to him than to themselves to joyfully seize this opportunity of giving tangible shape to their gratitude and love, that, despairing of being able to start the movement in England, I was just about to write to Mr. [W. D.] O'Connor or Mr. [John] Burroughs, and ask leave to join, as far as my modest means permit, in any scheme of the kind that might be afoot in America; for there must be some such. But now, of course, I shall most gladly join in the plan you propose, which seems to me very excellent. . . . I shall be ready to send you £10 the end of next week, or as soon after as you appoint. . . . I have little doubt in my own mind but that his very slow progress toward recovery (if progress it can be called; in a letter I received from him a few days before my Mother's death he said "My illness has not lifted," and mentions a recurrence of the distressing sensations in the head from which he suffered so much at first) is due to the pressure of anxiety—the efforts to work—the having had to remain in the hot latitude of Philadelphia all through the summer, instead of going north to some cool bracing mountain or sea air.

CLARENCE GOHDES

*Duke University*

---

### THE SYMBOLISM IN HAUPTMANN'S *VELAND*

Of the many poets who have treated the myth of Wieland the smith,<sup>1</sup> Gerhart Hauptmann seems to be the first to have given

<sup>5</sup> Signora Helen Rossetti Angeli has kindly supplied copies of this and the following letters.

<sup>1</sup> P. Maurus: *Die Wielandsage*, München, 1902.

the legend symbolical content. Richard Wagner before him was certainly aware of the possibilities which the story of Wieland offers for philosophical interpretation. At the end of *Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft* (1849) Wagner relates the tale of Wieland's suffering as an example of the *Volkskunst* which he has been preaching in the essay. At that time the *Meister* was still an ardent revolutionary, a champion of free thought, democracy and socialism. He therefore interprets the Wieland myth as a protest of the *Volk* against the tyranny and greed of monarchs. But in the sketch which Wagner made the following year for a music drama on the Wieland theme, there is no evidence of any symbolism in Wieland's struggle against King Neiding. The conflict here is a struggle for power between the smith and the king. Hauptmann's *Veland* is thus the first symbolical treatment of the Wieland myth in literature.<sup>2</sup>

The composition of the work throws some light on its nature. Although the drama did not appear in its present form till 1925, the bulk of it was written in 1896-7,<sup>3</sup> between the publication of *Die versunkene Glocke* and *Fuhrmann Henschel*—at a time, therefore, when Hauptmann was forsaking naturalism for symbolism. Thirty years later, when he finished the play, he had behind him an impressive list of prose and poetical works, including three expressionistic dramas (*Winterballade*, *Der weiße Heiland*, *Indipohdi*), and was on his way back to the social drama of his first period (*Dorothea Angermann*). Thus both the beginning and the end of *Veland* were written at a time when Hauptmann was wavering between two literary techniques. As a result of this circumstance, the work combines the features of both literary movements: it is a symbolical treatment of a naturalistic theme.

In *Veland* Hauptmann repeats the theme of *Die Weber*: both plays depict the tragedy of modern industrial civilization. Both plays describe a society divided against itself, waging a ruthless civil war, which can only end with the ruin of all the combatants and the destruction of all higher human values. The two chief

<sup>2</sup> Hauptmann's originality is very clearly shown by a comparison of his *Veland* with Hans Friedrich Blunck's *Streit mit den Göttern* (1926). Blunck also treats the Wieland theme symbolically; his Wieland is the Germanic Prometheus, fighting man's battles against the gods.

<sup>3</sup> The early version of the play is published in *Ausblicke* (Berlin, 1924), pp. 270 ff.

antagonists in the symbolical play, Veland the smith and King Harald Schönhaar, symbolize the urban proletariat and modern capitalism respectively. The other two important characters in the drama, Harald's daughter Bödwild and the shepherd Ketill, embody the dramatist's solution to the class conflict, Ketill in particular acting as Hauptmann's spokesman.

Veland is described as a former god, sage, seer and magician, as well as a physical giant, endowed with boundless energy.<sup>4</sup> All his life has been spent in digging metals out of the bowels of the earth and shaping them into useful and ornamental articles. At one time he was a dignified artisan, happy in his work, pursuing an ideal of beauty, symbolized by the swan maiden Herwar Allweiß.<sup>5</sup> Tragedy entered Veland's life when the greedy king learned of his existence and resolved to exploit the smith's great skill for selfish ends. He directed his minions to capture Veland, and to seize his wealth. Then he crippled the smith by cutting the tendons at his left ankle and right knee and condemned him to a life of bitter toil. Reduced to the condition of a beast, scarcely resembling a human being, Veland has sworn vengeance against his oppressor and the execution of his scheme of revenge constitutes the action of our drama.

Two acts of retribution are plotted by the smith against his tormentor. The first is a variation of Atreus' unnatural revenge against his brother Thyestes. Veland intends to murder the king's two sons,<sup>6</sup> invite the monarch to a banquet and offer him wine in bowls fashioned from the skulls of his children. As soon as Veland recognizes the bond of love that ties the beautiful Bödwild to him, a second scheme of vengeance is formed in his sick brain. By seducing Bödwild he will beget a son who shall be condemned, like himself, to unceasing suffering and humiliation.<sup>7</sup> Although his desire to seduce Bödwild has its origin in raw hatred,<sup>8</sup> it is not long before the smith has invented a noble motive to justify his evil deed. He hopes in this way to rediscover the world of beauty which he has lost through his enslavement by the king. In other words, he believes he can find Eros (Hervar) through sex (Bödwild):

<sup>4</sup> *Veland*, pp. 15, 19, 23, 32, 34, 35. These and subsequent references are to the 1932 edition of Hauptmann's plays published by Fischer in Berlin.

<sup>5</sup> P. 37.

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 21, 22, 29.

<sup>7</sup> P. 27.

<sup>8</sup> Pp. 27, 40.

Der Rache Flügel sprossen deutlich schon  
am künstlichen Gestricke meiner blutigen List,  
und bald entheben Riesenschwingen mich davon,  
ihr, der Vermissten, nach: sie kann mir nicht entgehn.<sup>9</sup>

When Veland's lust for revenge has at last been satisfied and the smith has finally outgrown the crude ethic of an eye for an eye; after he has obtained release from his suffering and has once more become a liberated god, he has a vision of his son Wittig seated on Harald's throne allowing his subjects to enjoy the happiness which God has denied them.<sup>10</sup>

Veland possesses all the characteristics of the class-conscious proletarian. He realizes that he is being exploited by the robber king for grossly selfish ends.<sup>11</sup> He maintains to the end that defiance of God and religion which is so typical of official Marxian socialism. He sneers at God, who is either deaf to the misery of the masses<sup>12</sup> or just another Harald, deliberately oppressing the poor and the weak.<sup>13</sup> God the All-Father, cries the smith, hypocritically promises happiness to his poor slaves, just as the murderer conceals his dagger beneath a clump of roses.<sup>14</sup> It is God who has deprived him of Herwar, his ideal of beauty.<sup>14</sup> So he banishes God from his heart and founds a religion of his own. This new faith is the Marxian creed: to do good to his fellow proletarians and evil to their oppressors.<sup>14</sup>

But it is with a heavy heart that Veland proceeds to carry out his ruthless acts of vengeance. The murder of the princes in particular weighs on his conscience. At first he tries to persuade himself, Nietzsche fashion, that all creation necessitates crime.<sup>15</sup> This flimsy piece of rationalization, however, does not satisfy him. So he resorts to a more subtle way of excusing the promptings of his brute instinct. In order to justify his desire for revenge and to escape the feeling of guilt which pursues him, he welcomes

<sup>9</sup> P. 59. Although this passage is immediately followed by the murder of the princes, it can only refer to Veland's second act of vengeance, the seduction of Bödwild. There is a fine psychological connection between the seduction of the princess and Veland's dream of rediscovering Herwar, but none whatever between the murder of the two children and that dream.

<sup>10</sup> P. 111.

<sup>12</sup> P. 110.

<sup>11</sup> Pp. 34, 60.

<sup>14</sup> P. 109.

<sup>13</sup> P. 107.

<sup>15</sup> P. 22.

cruelty, martyrdom, oppression at the hands of the king<sup>16</sup>—a mechanism well known to analytical psychology.<sup>17</sup>

Veland never outgrows this bitter hatred of the man who exploited him; and herein lies the real tragedy of his life. For he realizes, before the play ends, how little is accomplished by mere hatred. But it is too late; he has become a slave to his desire for vengeance. It is destiny to which even the gods must bow:

Bin ich ein Gott, entrinn ich doch mir selber nicht,  
und nicht dem Schicksal, das zum Spielzeug mich erkor.  
Und ohne Gnade zwingt es, zu vollenden mich  
und auszuspeien die grauenvolle Nachtgeburt,  
die es in meinem Haupte ausgebrütet, wie  
in einem Vipernei.<sup>18</sup>

And so he follows the dictates of his hatred to the end, believing against his better judgment that he can return to his former dignity and greatness by satisfying his instinct for vengeance.

His antagonist the king likewise remains unchanged at heart, in spite of his horrible experience. He is from the beginning to the end the hard, grasping capitalist, to whom all sense of justice or mercy is alien. Personal injury alone can check his will to power and his lust for wealth. It is only after he has felt the agony caused by the disappearance of his children that he realizes how unjust his treatment of Veland has been. Even then his repentance is only skin deep. Like Pharaoh of Egypt he is ready to make all sorts of promises as long as the plague is upon him. But no sooner has the danger been averted, than he is the old Pharaoh again.<sup>19</sup> For there is no doubt that Harald would throw Veland

<sup>16</sup> P. 39.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Franz Alexander: *The Psychoanalysis of the Total Personality* (New York, 1930).

<sup>18</sup> P. 81. The earlier version of the drama is even more explicit on this point. In it Veland says to Harald:

O Jarl, wär unentrinnbar nicht der Norne Spruch,  
ich ließe unvollendet meine Rache gern.  
Ein Etwas hat den Haß gedämpft in meiner Brust.  
Doch Veland's Höllen sind nun einmal jetzt im Gang;  
und Veland selbst vermag sie nicht zu löschen, noch  
Jarl Harald zu befreien aus dieser Höllen Brunst,  
und wär der Jarl mein Vater.

(*Ausblicke*, p. 352/3)

<sup>19</sup> Pp. 33-4, 36, 38.

into chains once more the moment the latter released the two princes from his power.

The one character in the play who does undergo a radical transformation is Princess Bödwild. She first appears on the scene decked out with all the blind prejudices and hatreds of her class. Before the drama ends, she is a totally different person: a greedy, vain, hatefully arrogant viper has become a humble Christian woman, full of pity for the suffering Veland and devoted to him with a boundless love. "Knecht" she cries to Veland in her first speech in the play,

Knecht, Knuten gibt es, deinen ekelhaften Leib  
mit Schwielen zu bedecken. Hüte deinen Blick!  
Und eh mich jemals deine plumpe Arbeitsfaust  
streife: viel lieber nehm ich einen Tausendfuß,  
als das zu dulden, ruß'ges Scheusal, in mein Bett.<sup>20</sup>

Before long the "sooty monster" has become a god:<sup>21</sup>

O Veland, Grauen faßt mich, denn du bist kein Mensch.  
Zum Gotte hast du dich gewandelt, jetzt, im Augenblick,  
mit einem Gotte hat mein Schicksal mich vermählt.<sup>22</sup>

Now Veland is holy through his suffering; he is blessed by his pain; free in his chains; honored because of his shame; mighty through his impotence; pure because of his scabs; refined and hardened by his humiliations.<sup>23</sup>

This radical change takes place in Bödwild immediately after she has been seduced by Veland. It is the result of the physical union between them. Veland's dream of attaining Eros through sex has become reality—in her, not in him. Now her fierce hatred and boundless contempt for the smith turn first to pity and then to love and she links her future to his with wholehearted devotion. Bödwild's conversion, which at first sight seems entirely unmotivated, is really not at all unexpected. For from the outset Veland has exerted an irresistible influence upon her. In spite of her loathing for the "ugly monster" she has visited his smithy again and again.<sup>24</sup> It was not merely greed for the beautiful trinkets he fashioned that brought her there. She was drawn to him by a deep love which disguised itself in the mask of hatred, because the conventions of her caste pronounced this love taboo.<sup>25</sup> She admits

<sup>20</sup> P. 26.      <sup>21</sup> P. 79.      <sup>22</sup> P. 80.      <sup>23</sup> P. 76.      <sup>24</sup> Pp. 28, 66.

<sup>25</sup> This phenomenon is also familiar to analytical psychology. Cf. Healy,

to Veland that she has often dreamt of being seduced by him;<sup>26</sup> these dreams are obviously wish fulfilments.

This new Bödwild, the embodiment of Eros in the Christian sense of pity, unselfishness, humility, and self-sacrifice<sup>27</sup>—this new Bödwild alone can bridge the gap between the two hostile classes represented by her father and her lover. She has exchanged the rôle of Gersuind for that of Ottegebe, has risen from sex to Eros. She alone is able to stir in Veland a feeling of pity for the fate of King Harald.<sup>28</sup>

Bödwild's conversion indicates Hauptmann's solution to the conflict depicted in the drama. The social problem, the poet says, cannot be solved by hatred or *Klassenkampf*, but by love and tolerance. In order to leave no doubt as to his views on the matter, Hauptmann has created the figure of the shepherd Ketill,<sup>29</sup> a spiritual brother of Emanuel Quint. Ketill, who is the *raisonneur* of the piece, appears twice before Veland, to warn him against the ruinous course he is pursuing. Vengeance and hatred, says the shepherd, destroy the soul and reduce the world to ashes.<sup>30</sup> He preaches Hauptmann's familiar gospel of loving one's enemies, tolerance, patience, humility.<sup>31</sup> Veland rejects the shepherd's advice; he prefers to bring salvation to his own class only, and to shun religion as treacherous and deceptive.<sup>32</sup> Because the dramatist does not believe that this is the way to solve the social problem, he ends the play tragically. To be sure, Veland flies away full of hope for the future; but his wings of fire will not carry him to Herwar the beautiful until he too undergoes Bödwild's spiritual conversion from hatred to love.

H. STEINHAEUER

*University of Saskatchewan*  
*Saskatoon, Canada*

---

Bronner and Bowers: *The Structure and Meaning of Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1930), p. 20 ff.

<sup>26</sup> P. 71.

<sup>27</sup> P. 78.

<sup>28</sup> Her own expressions of hatred for her father (p. 77) are not to be taken at their face value. They merely serve to indicate her deep remorse for the injustice she has done Veland in hating and scorning him. These outbursts will subside, leaving nothing in her breast but Christian love and pity for everyone.

<sup>29</sup> Ketill does not belong to the Wieland myth. <sup>30</sup> Pp. 63, 64, 106.

<sup>31</sup> Pp. 63, 105. Cf. Chapiro: *Gespräche mit Gerhart Hauptmann* (Berlin, 1932), pp. 114-5. <sup>32</sup> P. 111.



"UNE TRANCHE DE VIE"

The *Larousse Universel* (s. v. tranche), states that the expression "une tranche de vie" was first employed by Jean Jullien, one of the authors of the Théâtre Libre. O. G. Guerlac<sup>1</sup> accepts this statement and cites the passage from Jullien's *Le Théâtre Vivant* (1892) where it appears. The *Larousse du Vingtième Siècle* repeats the statement as it was given in the *Larousse Universel*. *L'Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux* (10 mai 1916) contains the following: "Une tranche de vie.—De quand date cette expression: à qui faut-il l'attribuer?" Whether because of the troubled times or for other reasons, these questions went unanswered.

The expression was in use, however, before the Théâtre Libre had come into existence and, as might be expected, was used in reference to French naturalism. In spite of its later popularity it does not seem to have found its way into print very often before the year 1892. José Yxart, who in 1894 and 1895 wrote a series of articles dealing with the Spanish stage for *La Vanguardia* of Barcelona, ended his critique of *La Verbena de la Paloma* by saying that this play

sin chistes de autor, con su ambiente de vida real y popular, con su espontaneidad y ligereza, es un verdadero sainete tradicional: lo que diez años atrás llamaban los naturalistas franceses: *une tranche de vie*, llevada al teatro.<sup>2</sup>

A more specific reference is to be found in the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Revue Suisse* for June, 1885, which contains in its *Chronique parisienne* an article on the Salon for that year. In discussing a painting exhibited at the Salon the writer says in part:

Bien entendu, ce n'est pas là un reproche, car ce manque d'unité fait partie du système, et les tableaux de la nouvelle école visent, comme les romans naturalistes, à mériter l'éloge que M. Zola a fait de l'*Education sentimentale* de Flaubert et à être, suivant son expression, 'une tranche de la vie,' découpée.<sup>3</sup>

The only real "éloge" of this novel that Zola ever published, to my knowledge, appeared in *Le Voltaire* for December 9, 1879,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Les Citations Françaises*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1933, p. 238.

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in *El arte escénico en España*, Barcelona, 1896, II, 112.

<sup>3</sup> P. 593.

and the phrase does not occur there. What Zola wrote was "lambeau," not "tranche." In this laudatory review of the *Education sentimentale* he said: "Qu'est-ce donc que cette *Education sentimentale*? Simplement un livre d'histoire, un lambeau de notre vie à tous." It may be that the writer of the article in the *Revue Suisse* remembered wrongly and unconsciously substituted for Zola's "lambeau" a new expression which was later to catch the popular fancy; or it may be that Zola was the first to use the phrase in an unreported speech or article.

It is obvious that "une tranche de vie" was not first employed by Jean Jullien in 1892, that the expression came into existence prior to June, 1885, and that it was first used in connection with the writings of the naturalists.

G. I. DALE

Cornell University

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Jean-Jacques Rousseau Moraliste.* By CHARLES WILLIAM HENDEL, 2 vols. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. ix + 316 + 348. 8°.

The author says in his short Preface, "My object has been to determine what the ideas of Rousseau really were." This would be a superfluous statement, with a title like his, if it were not that, as a matter of fact, the ideas of R. had been most of the time *not* presented as "they really were." What Mr. Handel evidently means is that he tried to remain impartial; and in this he has extremely well succeeded. It looks as if, by and by, we would have objective studies of Rousseau.

The method adopted has been to follow minutely the "Philosophe de Genève" in all the shades, in all the meanders of his ever-evolving ideas. This work is very conscientiously done; perhaps too conscientiously, for this is an almost sure method of getting lost. Evidently if Rousseau had been always clear and consistent, a two-volume work of closely printed pages would not be necessary; but the conscientious repetition of R's gropings will hardly elucidate his fundamental thought. The writer ventures to say that many a reader will be just as much puzzled after reading Mr. Handel's

\*This article of fulsome praise for the *Education sentimentale* is not included in the biography of Flaubert by Descharmes and Dumesnil which occurs at the end of *Autour de Flaubert*, Paris, 1912, II.

book as after reading Rousseau himself. Whenever Rousseau is clear, Mr. Hendel is clear too; but, when Rousseau needs interpretation, so does Mr. Hendel, and after all, Rousseau remains the preferable text to consult (as an illustration, one may read the pages devoted to R.'s ideas on religion, sentimental and civil). Moreover, at times there is necessarily a good deal of guessing, for it is very hard to be sure that the mind of a man worked exactly the way we might imagine.

But let us come to Mr. H.'s great thesis. He claims to have discovered that Rousseau was above all a disciple of Plato, and this quite original theme is developed with great talent indeed. The reader may well be surprised to see how far the parallelism can be followed up. Moreover, a thesis recently published, *Essai sur les lectures de Rousseau* (Genève, Jullien, 1934), bears out well enough Mr. H.'s contention. The author of that thesis, M. Richebourg, did not, in the main, attempt to do more than check the readings mentioned by R. himself, or such as were easily identified as obvious references to such and such an author—which means that Plato would probably have many more references to claim than those given in that essay—but, even as it is, we find, in the indices, that Plato has 58 items; Buffon, who stands next, 50, Montaigne 33, Montesquieu 25, Locke 19, Fénelon 18, Hobbes (cited to be attacked) 10, Lamy 7, Malebranche 3.<sup>1</sup> Only the Bible and Plutarch are mentioned more often than Plato, but the first because all the biblical authors are under one heading, the second for reasons other than merely philosophical. Thus, this close relation of Rousseau's thought and Plato's can be readily accepted. What might be said is that, on the one hand, Mr. H. seems to introduce Rousseau's Platonism too early, when R.'s ideas had not begun at all to shape themselves into philosophical doctrines; while, on the other hand, when R. had reached maturity of thought, and especially in his great works, the question may well arise: for how many ideas is R. still a debtor to Plato? And if there is no debt, would it not be just as true to say that Plato was a Rousseauist as that Rousseau was a Platonist? Is this not an occasion to emphasize—once more—the danger of over-emphasizing *influences*? Must a great writer, forever now, be interesting to professors only in as much as he is under some *influence*, that is, in as much as he is not himself; and must he cease to count, the moment he dares think for himself? In so far as Rousseau and Plato are concerned, everyone will have to form his own opinion in reading Mr. H.'s two compact volumes. Observe, however, that about a dozen of the 58 passages in the thesis mentioned above are in reference to music, and not to philosophical topics; that Rousseau is not an author who conceals his readings like *e. g.*, Chateau-

<sup>1</sup> These are only some of the more interesting names chosen here for our purpose.

briand; that three times the mention refers to the same subject—that of Plato's willingness to dispense with poets in his Republic; that one passage referred to reads: "Où est le plus petit écolier de droit qui ne dressera un code d'une morale aussi pure que celle des lois de Platon?" (I, 222); and another, "Les préceptes de Platon sont très sublimes; mais combien n'erret-il pas quelquefois, et jusqu'où ne vont pas ses erreurs?" (III, 146.)

Mr. H. thinks that "Biography is essential at all times for the understanding of R.'s thought" (vii). Certainly one must agree that passing events did affect temporarily his thoughts one way or another; but when it comes to his thoughts prepared "à tête reposée" and his philosophical writings, one cannot feel sure. Therefore, the long account—occupying nearly one-sixth of the whole first volume—of the quarrel with Diderot-Grimm-Epinay seems out of proportion, especially when compared with an eleven-page account of the *Lettres morales*—this in a book bearing as title *Rousseau moraliste*; the same thing might be said of the story of the circumstances of publication of *Emile and the Contrat Social*, or of the rather insignificant Palissot affair. But, however that may be, Mr. H. has set—the writer purposely says *set*, for one can hardly yet say "followed"—a noble example; he never insists on certain circumstances in the life of Rousseau which have made the delight, for generations, of people afflicted with a black liver; and he has taken excellent advantage of the recently completed *Correspondance Générale*.<sup>2</sup>

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

---

*Die Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung.* Von JULIUS PETERSEN. [Erweiterter Abdruck aus "Dichtung und Volkstum," Bd. 35.] Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934. 66 Seiten.

Dieses Buch musste geschrieben werden. Es lässt sich schlechtdings kein Thema denken, das gerade in diesem weltgeschichtlichen Augenblick vom Standpunkt der Geistesgeschichte aus stärker zur Behandlung drängte als eben der Vorstellungskomplex vom Dritten Reiche, der, gestern noch dem Reiche des Traumes angehörig, heute seinen Namen einem realen Staatsgebilde aufgeprägt hat. Dass es Professor Petersen zugefallen ist, den Nationalsozialismus in geistesgeschichtlicher Beziehung aus der Taufe zu heben, ist ein Umstand, zu dem man dem Kinde in Hinsicht auf die vorliegende Studie gratulieren darf.

<sup>2</sup> There are few such slips as the mention of Diderot's *Fils naturel* as a novel and references to the article *Economie politique* as one of the "Discours."

In seiner bewundernswürdigen Beherrschung des äusserst weit gespannten geistesgeschichtlichen Rahmens erweist sich Petersen als der berufene Interpret der Fülle von Wunschvorstellungen verschiedenster Herkunft und Orientierung, die in das Zauberwort vom Dritten Reich einmünden. An Hand der Sprangerschen Typenlehre unterscheidet Petersen sechs Erscheinungsformen des Wunschbildes, die den sechs Denkformen des vorwiegend ästhetisch, religiös, heroisch, theoretisch, ökonomisch bzw. sozial eingestellten Menschen entsprechen. Die Vorstellungen vom Goldenen Zeitalter, vom Gottesstaat, vom imperialen Weltreich, vom humanistischen Reich des Geistes und vom kommunistisch gefärbten "Völkerfrühling und Menschheitspfingsten" werden in je einem Kapitel in ihrer historischen Entwicklung verfolgt, während der Weltwirtschaftsraum, als dem Gebiet der Sage und Dichtung ferner liegend, nur flüchtig gestreift wird. Als abschliessendes Kapitel folgt endlich ein Überblick über die aus dem idealen Bereich gespeisten Kräfte, die zur Verwirklichung des deutschen Volksstaats geführt haben.

Um aus der Fülle des dargebotenen Stoffes einen Hauptpunkt herauszugreifen, sei als wesentlich vermerkt: das Schlagwort vom Dritten Reich, vom *tertium saeculum*, das seine Quellen letzten Endes im Johannisevangelium und in der Apokalypse hat, erscheint um 1200 in den Schriften des kalabrischen Abtes Gioachino di Fiore, dessen Schau das Reich des Alten Bundes und das des Neuen Bundes mit den Personen von Gottvater und Gottsohn gleichsetzt und ein kommendes Drittes Reich verkündet, das im Zeichen des Parakleten, des Heiligen Geistes stehen werde. Diese Ahnung, die sich von nun an im Laufe der Jahrhunderte nie ganz verliert, erwacht zu neuem Leben in Lessings *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, indem Lessing die Offenbarungen des Alten und des Neuen Bundes als blosse, dem jeweiligen Fassungsgrade des Menschen angepasste Stufen auffasst und mit prophetischem Feuer ein drittes, ewiges Evangelium verkündet, das dem zu moralischer Mündigkeit erwachten Menschen angemessen sei. Die Auswirkungen des von Lessing neu angeregten Gedankens werden nun nachgewiesen von Fichte und Schiller über die Romantik bis zum französischen Saint-Simonismus und seinen deutschen Geistesverwandten, Heine und dem Jungen Deutschland. Etwas später greift dann, ebenfalls unter dem Einfluss deutschen Denkens, Ibsen das Schlagwort vom Dritten Reich wieder auf in seiner gross angelegten Tragödie *Kaiser und Galiläer*. Durch Ibsen wieder wird der Traum vom Dritten Reich zu einem ideellen Generalnenner der Erneuerungsbestrebungen des um die Brüder Heinrich und Julius Hart gescharten Literatenkreises, der um die Jahrhundertwende in Berlin wirkte, und diesem Kreise gehörte in jungen Jahren auch Möller van den Bruck an, der dann das Schlagwort vom Dritten Reich unmittelbar der Parteifahne des Nationalsozialismus aufgeheftet hat.

Bedauerlich ist in dieser gross angelegten Schau bloss die Fehldatierung von *Kaiser und Galiläer*. Seite 46-48 werden die polaren Spannungen "eines halben Jahrhunderts" von der Juliantragödie aus orientiert, unter Hinweis u. a. auf Marx' Gründung des *Vorwärts*, Kierkegaards *Entweder-Oder*, Stirners Hauptwerk und die Geburt Nietzsches, die sämtlich in die Jahre 1843-44 fallen. Die Juliantragödie aber erschien nicht, wie hier angenommen, im Jahre 1893, sondern bereits zwanzig Jahre früher, womit der stark betonte chronologische Unterbau des dargelegten Beziehungskomplexes einen empfindlichen Stoss erleidet.

Die in den ersten sechs Kapiteln besprochenen Typen des Heilsgedankens waren alle universalistisch eingestellt, sie hatten sich auf die ganze Menschheit bezogen. Anders steht es dagegen mit dem nationalsozialistischen Typus: Dieser beschränkt sich in nachdrücklichster Weise auf das eigene Volk. Wie gestalten sich nun die Beziehungen dieses Neulings zu den sechs schon durch ihr ehrwürdiges Alter legitimierten universalistischen Vorstellungstypen?

Die Kunst der Regie, mit welcher Petersen die Einführung des Neuankömmlings in den erlauchten geistesgeschichtlichen Reigen inszeniert, verdient alle Bewunderung. Das Wort Reigen ist mit Absicht gewählt. Schon zu Anfang der Abhandlung nämlich fanden die sechs Typen sich mit verschlungenen Händen zu einem kreisförmigen Schema gruppiert. Wo wäre da Raum für weiteren Zuwachs? Nachdem also alle Möglichkeiten der Typenbildung erschöpft sind, "gibt die Magnetnadel des Kompasses den rastlosen Kreisgang des Uhrzeigers auf, indem sie sich nach der Tiefe senkt, wo der Pol der nationalen Selbstbestimmung ruht" (51). Und siehe, in der Mitte des Reigenes erscheint der nationalsozialistische Vorstellungstyp. Aber nicht etwa als Parvenü, wie man vielleicht glauben möchte. O nein, er ist keineswegs von schlechten Eltern; vielmehr weisen seine Züge unverkennbare Ähnlichkeiten mit denen des ehrwürdigen Sechsgestirns auf, die ihn denn auch als ihren zeitgemässen Sprössling begrüßen. Wie sich versteht, haben alle sechs erlauchten Ahnen den positiven Teil ihres Wesens zu seiner Erbmasse beigeuert.

Damit ist aber die Wandlungsfähigkeit des denksymbolischen Schemas (das vielleicht auf Anregungen der in den Anmerkungen zitierten *Denkformen* Hans Leisegangs, 1928, zurückgeht) keineswegs erschöpft. Wir erleben gewissermassen die Urform eines geistesgeschichtlichen Balletts. Auf einen Wink des Regisseurs erfolgt eine Vierteldrehung des Schemas nach rechts, und die Vorstellungstypen eins und vier, die Ideale der Dichtung und des Denkertums, treten als zeit- und raumlos zur Seite und postieren sich auf die Flügel, womit eine Eingliederung der übrigen "in Zeit und Raum, eine Beziehung zur Geschichte und zur Lagerung der europäischen Landkarte sichtbar wird." "Die theokratischen und kommunistischen Ideen haben im Osten, die imperialistischen und föderativen im Westen zeitweilige Berührung mit dem Boden der

politischen Wirklichkeit gefunden" (51). Der Hinweis auf das heutige Russland, auf den — allerdings ausserhalb Europas gelegenen — theokratischen Judenstaat, auf das Napoleonische Imperium und auf den französisch-angelsächsischen Völkerbund liegt auf der Hand. So glücklich dieser einfache Kunstgriff auf den ersten Blick auch anmutet, so regen sich doch gewisse Bedenken, wenn man sich fragt: Wo bleibt bei dieser Verlagerung der imperialistischen Idee nach dem Westen die Erinnerung an den Imperialismus etwa der Stauferkaiser, um von dem römischen Imperium gar nicht zu reden? Indessen ist diese Frage sowohl unbequem wie verfrüht. Denn nun spielt der Ballettmeister seinen letzten Trumpf aus: der Nationalsozialismus, von je zwei seiner Ahnen flankiert, weicht um einen Schritt zurück, und vor ihm wird, aus der Versenkung heraufsteigend, ein neuer Mitspieler sichtbar, der nun mit dem Nationalsozialismus zusammen eine geographische Nord-Südachse bildet. Man errät, wen man vor sich hat. Das faschistische Italien und das neue Deutschland begrüßen sich als geistesverwandtes Brüderpaar. Man sieht hier jedenfalls in vorbildlicher Weise das seltene Schauspiel, wie Geistesgeschichte und Politik sich die Hände reichen.

Trotz solcher gelegentlicher Obertöne wird kein Leser gefahr laufen, dies Buch mit einer politischen Tagesbroschüre zu verwechseln. Ausdrücklich ist vielmehr die vornehme Objektivität und unbeirrbar Sachlichkeit in der Darstellung hervorzuheben. Den gediegenen Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte wird der Germanist nach gründlichem Studium aus der Hand legen mit lebhaftem Dank für vielseitige Anregung und Bereicherung.

HERMANN J. WEIGAND

*Yale University*

---

*Charles Lamb and his Contemporaries.* By EDMUND BLUNDEN.

New York: the Macmillan Company. Pp. x + 216. \$2.00.

Mr. Blunden's book makes no attempt to cover afresh the whole of the available ground or to replace Mr. E. V. Lucas's invaluable biography. It is full of much fine and unobtrusive scholarship; but it is avowedly complementary, and sets out to sketch with somewhat altered emphasis the personality of its subject rather than to paint a full length portrait.

It is not inept to compare this book with Pater's essay on Lamb. There is something of the same grace and sensitiveness in both; but there are also moments in both when one begins to feel uncertain whether the man they present is the real Lamb. It is, indeed, no disservice either to Lamb or to his admirers to shift, as Mr. Blunden has done, the emphasis from his puns to his piety or from the excesses of a convivial evening to the afterthoughts of the

following morning. Yet Mr. Blunden's evocation is not quite satisfactory, for Lamb was, after all, more robust and — dare one say it — more earthy than Mr. Blunden will allow. The truth is that the author comes a shade too much between us and his subject, for Lamb, when all is said and done, must be allowed to speak for himself, and the skill with which Mr. Lucas's *Life* is written lies in no small measure in the extent to which he is allowed to do so. Lamb's personality, more than that of most authors, inevitably suffers some distortion in the mirror of another mind, however sympathetic and understanding.

One is tempted, too, to suggest that the rigors of thirty-five years' unremitting labor at an office-desk lose some of their sharpness of outline when seen from the quiet seclusion of a study window. His work in the service of the East India Company was the real centre round which Lamb's life revolved, as is surely shown by the fact that when it came to an end he was both unable and unwilling to summon his remaining energies to any concentrated literary task. One may share Mr. Blunden's lingering regret that he did not do so, however, without even feeling that anything more was to be expected from him. As Mr. Blunden himself has indicated, Lamb knew better than anyone else that after 1824 his main life's work was done.

However, there are many fine things in this book. Mr. Blunden is at his best when he is relating Lamb's work to the background from which it sprang, and it would be difficult to overpraise chapters II and IV, on the New Poetry and the New Criticism. He has done a real service in directing attention to Lamb's verse, too often ignored, and the whole book is a fine tribute to the memory of one who, in spite of Mr. Blunden's forebodings, is still one of the best-loved figures in English literature.

R. C. BALD

*University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia*

---

*New Light on Longfellow.* With Special Reference to His Relations to Germany. By JAMES TAFT HATFIELD. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933. Pp. x + 188. \$2.75.

If more Americans would visit Craigie House and form even a partial acquaintance with its wealth of manuscripts and extensive collection of books in various literatures which reveal the poet who gathered them as an interpreter of European life and culture and as a cosmopolitan scholar who contributed much to the development of learning in this country, they would undoubtedly be filled with profound admiration for Longfellow as a distinguished figure in an important period of our intellectual history. Indeed, in our present age of narrow specialization, who can deny the need of his catholic interest?



In the course of years, studies, both adequate and inadequate, have been made of Longfellow's relations to European literature; but not until the publication of Mr. Hatfield's *New Light on Longfellow*, based on a careful examination of the unpublished material, has there appeared a systematic presentation of the poet's entire connection with Germany. This we follow from the year 1829, when he first entered that country, to the closing years of his life. Of particular importance are the chapters treating his fruitful experiences abroad in 1835-1836 and again in 1842, and the period of his Harvard professorship as the successor of Ticknor, when he was somewhat torn between academic duties and a strong desire to do creative work. In all this we observe his rôle as an exponent of German life and literature, especially his pioneer interest in Goethe. For it is significant that he was the first to make Goethe a living figure in American colleges. The author, however, has not deemed it necessary to include a detailed discussion of Longfellow's relations to the great poet, because, as he generously states, of a previous contribution to the *Germanic Review*. Furthermore, he refers to "the forthcoming valuable study" by Mr. Pochmann, to whom material on this subject was transmitted by Mr. Hatfield when he and the writer of this review were enjoying the courtesy of Craigie House.

Of further distinction is the analysis of *Hyperion*, of the German influence on Longfellow's poetry, and of his continued interest in German after his retirement from teaching. Then follows a summary, and an admirable characterization of the poet's personality and temperament, his human scholarship, and his place in American life. No real student of literature will disagree with the statement that he "must be accounted a notable humanist" in the strict meaning of the word, nor with the acclaim, "The historic tradition which he upheld is America's best inheritance from the past."

The illustrations, particularly Longfellow's sketch of himself as a student at Göttingen, and the copy of the drawing by Agassiz representing the pentagram in *Faust*, as well as the carefully prepared list of the poet's personal German associations and studies, including the selected bibliography, add greatly to the charm and value of the publication. Mr. Hatfield has, as throughout his long and useful career, performed a distinct service to American scholarship.

O. W. LONG

Williams College

*Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's "Vanity Fair."* Von LUDWIG BAUCKE. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co., 1932. Pp. 187. RM. 8.

*Neue Wertungen im Englischen Roman: Problemgeschichte des Englischen Romans im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert.* Von IRENE MARINOFF. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1932. Pp. 143.

These books are, respectively, interesting examples of German research, intensive and extensive. The first gives the results of a microscopic study of Thackeray's art of narrative in *Vanity Fair*. The second formulates appraisals based upon a careful survey of a wide and full area of English fiction. The first is sufficiently definitive. The second represents but one angle in the interpretation of an aspect of the English novel that is sure to be interpreted from many angles. After a consideration of Thackeray's art of narrative under eleven heads, Baucke closes with a twelfth, "Der Bau des Werkes." The last paragraph is typical at once of the author's style and conclusions.

Das Werk ist nicht aufgelöst in das ungestaltete, in seine einzelnen Bestandteile zerbröckelnde Nacheinander eines Stranges von Kapiteln. Der Bau erhebt sich "in the fullness of that biographical form achieved under Thackeray" klar gegliedert und abgestuft in seinen Teilen mit dem Grundriss der Fabel zweier Zentralfiguren, deren Schicksale sich ineinander verflechten und einander entgegensetzen. Die gestaltete Einheitlichkeit bedeutet keine grade Einfachheit, sondern die monumental angelegte Steigerung der bewegten Entwicklung und die zielstrebige Schichtung der beiden in der Mitte des epischen Interesses stehenden Gestalten. Die Zusammenfügung der mehrteilig gewebten Handlungsstücke lässt die einzigartige, in der Thematik kunstvoll verästelte und polyphon durchgeführte, durch die Anfangs- und Schlussgruppe der Kapitel ringförmig geschlossene und vollendete Gestalt eines die Welt des Menschlichen im Bilde spiegelnden Ganzen erstehen.

Miss Marinoff has founded her appraisals upon the examination of the work of more than fifty English novelists, with particular emphasis upon that of Arnold Bennett, John Galsworthy, D. H. Lawrence, Rose Macaulay, May Sinclair, Hugh Walpole, and H. G. Wells. She has evidently enjoyed the task. Her insight is generally good, her style clearer and less involved than that of most German scholars. A portion of the concluding paragraph of her "Anhang" will best summarize her findings.

Die vorstehende Behandlung und Stoffwahl der Technik bestätigt in vollem Masse das Ergebnis unserer Untersuchungen über die neuen Wertungen im modernen englischen Roman. Wir hatten als neue Geisterhaltung die Haltung des unbefangenen, vorurteilslosen Schauens in die Wirklichkeit gefunden und aus dieser Lebensschau auf das zugehörige Lebensgefühl geschlossen und die Welt der heute geltenden Werte abgeleitet. Und eben dieser Grundzug der vorurteilslosen Schau in das Leben findet sich in der Stoffwahl und Technik wieder. Wir sahen, dass bei der Stoffwahl das psychologische Interesse ausschlaggebend ist. Kein Stoff erscheint zu gering, zu abgelegen, um gestaltet zu werden. Die höchsten Höhen wie die tiefsten

Tiefen des Menschseins werden durchleuchtet. Der Mensch wird gesehen als ein ewiges Rätsel, das jedem anders gestellt wird, dessen völlige Lösung uns nicht gegeben ist. Diese neue Schau des Individuums erfordert eine ungeheure Verfeinerung der Technik. Sie hat die doppelte Aufgabe, ein rätselhaftes Menschentum zu gestalten, es lebenswahr zu gestalten. Lebensnähe soll nicht nur im Stoff, sondern auch in der Darstellung erreicht werden.

WALDO H. DUNN

*College of Wooster*

---

*George Eliot: Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-1854.* By P. BOURL'HONNE. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1933. Pp. 212.

Students of George Eliot have long desired a thorough and disinterested study of her moral philosophy. They will welcome M. Bourl'honne's book, which goes far towards the fulfillment of their desire.

This investigation into the content, origins, and value of George Eliot's "message" is based upon a carefully documented study of her life through the year 1854. M. Bourl'honne presents the novelist as a tragic figure, torn by an unceasing struggle between the idealism firmly rooted in her emotions and the realism with which her intellect grasped and accepted fact. She was, he thinks, "an eternal adolescent," who misapplied her remarkable powers to inventing a rationale of life at the time when she should have been concerned only with the business of living. Self-condemned to spend her later years in brooding contemplation of her own early mistakes, she drew from her experience a dreary philosophy that confused her readers because of its shifting emphasis, now on the freedom of the individual to work toward perfection, now on the power of environment and chance to negate his best efforts. Supplementing this analysis and critique of George Eliot's thought, M. Bourl'honne has written two brilliant chapters discussing the influence of Spencer, Lewes, Comte, Spinoza, and Feuerbach.

Not all readers will accept M. Bourl'honne's generalizations as valid to quite the extent to which he has pushed them, particularly his theory of delayed juvenilism and his insistence upon the important part played by ideology in George Eliot's rationalization of her union with Lewes. But the reconstruction of soul history is not an exact science; and the reader may admire and respect M. Bourl'honne's conclusions—indeed, he must—without subscribing to them completely. They are stimulating and provocative, and wholly within the bounds of possibility. It is disappointing to find no discussion of what seem to the reviewer two important lines of influence. One is the phrenological theories of Gall and Combe, whose systems George Eliot studied; and whose moral philosophy, based on phrenology, she paralleled in her *Early Essays*. The second is the catalytic influence of Rousseau and George Sand, which George Eliot acknowledged in the strongest terms.

But it is ungracious and ungrateful to dwell upon omissions where so much has been done so well. By virtue of its contents and its challenge M. Bours'onne's study is, after Cross's biography, the most useful book yet published on George Eliot.

MATHILDE PARLETT

Hendrix College

### BRIEF MENTION

*Anthology of the Classical Period of German Literature.* By GEORGE MADISON PRIEST. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934. Pp. x + 465. \$3.00. An anthology must be judged as a whole and from the standpoint of its editor's intention, for the critic can easily postulate the inclusion of some of his favorite authors and passages. Mr. Priest has succeeded in establishing a unified, compact survey of German literature, in which all important figures of the period in question are represented, even Winckelmann and Hamann. The only exchange one might wish for would be that of Mathison, without whom, especially after Schiller, our picture would be no less complete, for Maler Müller, who after all, adds something to the collective note of the *Sturm und Drang*. The notes are reduced to a minimum, which can only be welcomed, while the biographical sketches are somewhat pale and lacking in characterization of ideas represented. The following corrections, gathered at random, may be suggested: to p. 356 note 12 *gefeht und geult* (cleaned and swept) should be 'swept and dusted,' for *Uhle* (owl) is a round duster used for walls and ceilings; note 19 *Stufen* (here brackets) are probably 'graded shelves'; note 33 *verspündete* (was stuffing) is 'screwed tight'; to p. 359 note 6 *Marieel* should be characterized as a Baltic expression; Werther (note to p. 368) can hardly be called "at first a happy day dreamer" which would lead to a misinterpretation of the work as a mere love story; to p. 365 (The original version. . .) The emphasis on pity is entirely misleading. The first version of *Willkommen und Abschied* is motoric throughout and gives the original situation: the rider stops at the village limits, takes leave, and sees her walking home. Since this fact is not indicated, Goethe takes offence at its untypical supposition and has the girl look after the departing lover. The change, however, entails a break in the unity of the poem, the poet splits up into lover and observer and the identity of the speaker in the last two lines becomes doubtful.

The make-up of the anthology is to be especially commended in regard to binding, print, and paper. The use of *ss* instead of the generally adopted *ß*-sign in Roman print leads to difficulties in compounds.

ERNST FEISE

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

MAY, 1935

Number 5

---

## THE DATE OF THE *TROILUS*: AND MINOR CHAUCERIANA

### I

The publication of Professor Robinson's edition, with its broad picture of contemporary views on Chaucer, offers a compelling opportunity for reconsidering a few of them. Like several recent writers, he accepts for the *Troilus* the date 1385-6. But to others<sup>1</sup> the arguments for any late date are far from convincing; none of them explains any difficulty, all merely undertake to recognize allusions. It is hard to see evidence even for 1381 (or soon after) in iv, 141-217, where there is no allusion<sup>2</sup> to the English popular insurrection of June 1381, simply because (as Mr. E. D. Lyon points out to me) the outcry for the exchange of Antenor and Criseyde is merely in parliament. Though Boccaccio's account is much developed in Chaucer's, nevertheless, just as in the former the debate is among the *signori*, the *baron*, so in the latter it is in an English-seeming parliament, among its *lordes*, that Hector urges keeping her, and that against him

The noyse of peple up stirte thanne at ones,

As breame as blase of straw iset on fire.

(183-4)

There is a world of difference even now between "people" and "the people." Some readers have been misled here because probably we should not, as Chaucer would, use *people* for a crowd of disorderly M. P.'s, but *people* does not always mean commonalty, rabble, today any more than in Chaucer; or more here than where in the *Legend* the dreamer witnesses the procession of Good Women, and (l. 309)

Aboud to knowen what this peple mente.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ecce tot annis—posui ori meo custodiam.*

<sup>2</sup> Professor Carleton Brown, *MLN.*, xxvi, 208-11.

In the *Troilus* there is no mob bawling outside the parliament-house, but an uproar within (which is not unheard-of in England). Needless also to remark that the causes of the disturbance are no more similar than its participants, details, or location; there is no similarity except the shouting. When these facts are recognized, penetrating as it has seemed, the supposed parallel vanishes.

More impressive, no more cogent to some, is Professor Lowes' argument for 1382 or later,<sup>3</sup> which has found such favor. As in the last case, some see no difficulty to be explained, and see mere coincidence in an ingenious parallel where others have been disposed to see a double meaning. Criseyde stood matchless in beauty (I, 171-2),

Right as oure firste lettre is now an A.

Is A (even *an A*, with a word-play) for *Anna*, who married King Richard II in 1382, and is there an allusion to the frequent use of the royal initial (though by Mr. Lowes' showing mostly on the sovereigns' own clothes and utensils, and mostly long after this date)? It may be tempting to say yes, but on examination the feeling of compulsion breaks down at every point. "E. R." was not then on pillar-boxes. Why did Chaucer abandon Boccaccio's "elegant and graceful" comparison of his heroine to a rose among violets? Perhaps he found it, as Mr. Lowes did later (p. 291), "elegant but hackneyed." Why did he substitute the "prosaic, even banal" first-letter-A comparison? Dunbar, Henryson and a sixteenth century writer did not find the still less romantic "A per se" too banal a comparison for London, Criseyde and Jesus Christ; St. John the Divine did not find Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω banal.<sup>4</sup> Before the days of print, the alphabet had beauty, and its chief associations were high and even sacred; the cross headed the "Christ-cross row," and every second written page was liturgical or religious. Probably Chaucer fancied an A beautified with blue and gilt. Reading-matter did not blow about streets and soak in puddles. Was Chaucer so zealous for the A that he used Criseyda

<sup>3</sup> *PMLA.*, xxiii, 285-306.

<sup>4</sup> *Rev.*, I, 8, xxi, 6, xxii, 13; the passage is written "Ego sum α et ω" in every copy of the Vulgate which I can lay hand on, and medieval Latin poetry shows the Greek letters were sometimes pronounced here with their Latin names.—For Dunbar, etc., see *NED.* under A.

in rime to permit it? The indications are that he rather used the A to permit "Criseyda"; for emphasis perhaps at her first appearance in person, and perhaps he preferred this rithm.<sup>5</sup> Varying forms of foreign names are common in Chaucer. As to other difficulties which have been descried in the line, it is true no one can prove it does not mean "Our first (English) letter is now (since 1382) an (individualized) A." But the *oure* is no likelier to show national loyalty than the universal human *oure* of "*oure fre chois*," or "let *oure hedes nevere ake*," or "the feend *oure enemy*."<sup>6</sup> The pleonastic *now* is no more surprising than in

That wol I seyn, al were he now my brother.<sup>7</sup>

An A no more points to a human individual than Mr. Weller's "Put it down a we, My Lord, put it down a we." Chaucer is addicted to pleonastic words, far more than modern poets, who have preferred to gloss their little verse-problems with decorative epithets. All the arguments have now been regarded. For this interpretation of the line, we have our choice of accepting it because it is brilliant or having our doubts because it is needless.

The most imposing argument for a late date is Mr. Root's,—the fact that about 13 May, 1385, the moon, Jupiter and Saturn were in conjunction in Cancer, precisely as at the climax of Chaucer's poem;<sup>8</sup> and above all the fact that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Cancer had never occurred since 769 A. D., nor would recur before 1444. Since the moon would meet these slow planets once a month, and the platic conjunction lasted many weeks, the participation of the moon is insignificant for the date.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> While "Criseyde" is his usual form, he sometimes uses "Criséyda" to change and extend the rithm (II, 649, in Robinson and Skeat; II, 1424, in them and the Globe).

<sup>6</sup> *TC* IV, 1059; *LGW* 705; *PardT* 844; dozens of other passages.

<sup>7</sup> *LGW* 2392; there is no question of time here.

The bente moone with hire hornes pale,  
Saturne, and Jove, in Cancro joyned were.

(III, 624-5; Root in *PMLA.*, xxxix, 48-63). Chaucer says nothing of the date, but the new moon would be in Cancer only in late spring. It is not important to point out that conceivably, since this conjunction is among the most stormy of all, a poet well up in astrology, who wished to keep his characters housed, might have devised it *ex vacuo*.

<sup>9</sup> One or two of Professor Root's remarks about the moon (p. 62, note 34) seem to invite reconsideration.

It is well also to observe that, as Mr. Root notes (pp. 56, 53), so far from taking over the whole planetary configuration in May of 1385, Chaucer omits the most showy part, the conjunction of Venus with Jupiter and Saturn at this same time, and in fact contradicts the visible situation by putting Venus in the morning sky a few hours later (ll. 1417-8). He gives no photograph, only a selective sketch. This accords with a spectacle not seen but imagined, in a passage with no difficulty demanding explanation. Yet I would not minimize Mr. Root's acute observation; the point is that this coincidence seems a little too surprising to be fortuitous.

But there seems every probability that such a rare and threatening event should be long foreseen and mentioned among the astrologically-minded; the comment on it afterwards which Mr. Root records (pp. 54, 61) would lead us to expect early anticipation. The *Franklin's Tale* and other poems show how well-informed Chaucer could be as to the niceties of astrology, and he himself, to judge from the *Astrolabe*, studied the heavens with astrolabe, Toledo tables and understanding, and assuredly knew others who did. The motions and periods of the planets were well known, and excited far more interest than now. Few of us today know their positions, or even recognize the planets when we see them, or (still less) foresee their positions, but when everyone believed they caused momentous events on earth, their movements were watched (much as Mr. Root says, pp. 61-2) with almost painful interest. Everyone familiar with medieval chroniclers knows this. Eclipses had been forecast since the Greeks and Babylonians, and as Mr. Root shows,<sup>10</sup> it was easy to figure out past or future positions of the planets. Anyone could have done it, "litell Lowis my sone" could have done it. It is also a fact that the conjunctions and other aspects of the farther planets (Jupiter and Saturn being the farthest) were believed the most potent.<sup>11</sup> The supposition here made does no more than justice to the mental activity of early scientific men.

But we are not left to supposition; there is plenty of evidence that forecasts were actually made. So far as now known, the earliest eclipse foretold in England was that of the moon on the feast of the Circumcision, 1237, foretold by Master Walter le

<sup>10</sup> Pp. 52, 60; Skeat, III, 226-7.

<sup>11</sup> See, e. g., Franz Boll, *Sternglaube u. Sterndeutung* (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 34, 111, 135; Root, p. 60.



Pruz.<sup>12</sup> Richard of Wallingford (d. 1336) wrote a treatise on eclipses, and John Ashenden, fellow of Merton in 1338, is said in a medieval account to have prognosticated the Black Death from an eclipse of the moon, and in 1345 to have foretold eclipses of the moon and the positions of the three farthest planets,<sup>13</sup> which would be far easier to foretell than eclipses. These of course are mere casual specimens. To come nearer home, the Plimpton MS of Chaucer's *Astrolabe* (formerly Ashburnham App. CXXIII) contains information about six solar and six lunar eclipses between 1417 and 1433, which were probably at least in part computed in advance.<sup>14</sup> More significant is the proof, pointed out to me by Mr. Thomas George, that not only movements of the planets but just such conjunctions as Chaucer's were anticipated. On the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn (evidently in Pisces) 28 Apl., 1583, no less than three small books were published<sup>15</sup> some weeks and months ahead (two of them by brothers of Gabriel Harvey); the longest of them finished 6 Dec., 1582, nearly five months ahead, entered S. R. 22 Jan., 1583, and taken so seriously as to be replied to by the bishop of London, Thomas Nashe, and others. Pamphleteers did not vent their wares till the occasion approached, but astrologers knew what was coming long before, and presumably no more in the sixteenth century than in the fourteenth. Doubtless such cases could be multiplied. Does anyone suppose that before the invention of printing, and the spread of skepticism in the sixteenth century, interest in such things was at all less? For years before 1385 Jupiter (moving about 30° a year) would be seen gradually overhauling Saturn (moving about 12°), at the rate of 18° or about half a sign a year. Why limit the anticipation, as

<sup>12</sup> *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XLIV, 96.

<sup>13</sup> R. T. Gunther, *Early Science in Oxford* (Oxford, 1923), II, 50, 55.

<sup>14</sup> The ground for this statement (*a priori* likely) is as follows. All (probably) of the solar eclipses visible in England between 6 April, 1418, and 17 June, 1433, are given, and all the lunar between 25 Oct., 1417, and 2 Aug., 1422. It is seen that the two sets of six begin within five and a half months of each other (none being omitted between), but end eleven years apart; probably the date of writing was not after but before,—mid or late 1417. It would be too complicated to consider here the data as to times and durations. I am much indebted to Mr. G. A. Plimpton, and greatly to Professor W. F. Meyer.

<sup>15</sup> See *Works of Th. Nashe* (ed. R. B. McKerrow, London, 1904), I, 196, and especially v, 166-9.

Mr. Root does (p. 62), to two or three months? Even six or eight years earlier the two planets would be visible at the same time and far above the eastern and western horizons, and to the astrologic eye the momentous new conjunction would be equally visible. If a later one in this series was broadcast among the middle class some months before, should not the first of the series be foreseen by the expert some years before? The fact that the series had not occurred for six centuries, but hereafter for centuries would occur in wet signs at intervals of about twenty years,<sup>16</sup> would be especially likely to excite interest long before. Someone's casual remark as to this prospect would be enough to set Chaucer off. The fact that he omits the most showy part of the conjunction harmonizes at least as well with scientific foresight as with ocular observation.

I add a similar matter, though by no means as tending greatly against Mr. Root's date. At the point later where the catastrophe of the poem begins to loom, Hector's plan for a fight is made when the sun is in the sign Leo (iv, 32); at some unknown point, for "the breast" of the sign Leo is probably meaningless, mere poetic embellishment; and the constellation is even more out of the question. Therefore the date may be at any time between about 12 July and 12 August. Probably in order to evade responsibility in case of a chronological hitch, the poet oddly disclaims knowledge of the exact interval between the planning and the fight (36), but presumably it would be only a very few days. Directly after this fight (evidently) comes a truce, then immediately Calchas' request for Criseyde, the Greek embassy to Troy for exchange of prisoners, and the meeting of the Trojan parliament.<sup>17</sup> On one and the same day as this meeting come all the incidents down to the last night-meeting of the lovers,<sup>18</sup> and the next day Criseyde leaves Troy (v, 14-5). According to all the well-designed appearances, it would be within a few days of Hector's plan for his fight; this is not in the least forcing the evidence. Mr. Root (p. 50) clearly shows how exactly Chaucer times events in the poem. He continues to keep good track of the moon's positions (iv, 1592; in v, 648-658, Troilus watches the waning moon late at night),<sup>19</sup> and

<sup>16</sup> Root, p. 51, who gives much astrology to be borne in mind though not repeated here.

<sup>17</sup> iv, 57, 63-6, 140, 143.

<sup>18</sup> iv, 211, 350, 806-12, 885, 888, 914, 1114, 1126.

<sup>19</sup> Mr. Root's note in his edition on v, 648, might be questioned, in accordance with the invitation in his preface.

with all his absorption in human feeling and thinking, he had a constant eye also on times and seasons. It is just ten days later, we read,<sup>20</sup> that (v, 1016-20)

The brighte Venus folwede and ay taughte  
The wey ther brode Phebus down alighte;  
And Cynthea hire char-hors overraughte  
To whirle out of the Leoun, if she mighte;  
And Signifer his candels sheweth brighte.

Venus therefore is visible and is evening-star, the moon is about to leave Leo, it is fully night, and therefore Venus' distance from the sun is considerable. The sun is still in Leo and west of the moon, for the moon in Leo is new;<sup>21</sup> this harmonizes fully with the estimate previously worked out that this night is not much more than ten days after the day we started with, when the sun was in Leo. On the face of it, this spectacle looks likely enough to have been just seen. Now Dr. E. C. Bower (my thanks to him), astronomer in the University of California, assures me that in the thirteen years between 1375 and 1387 (inclusive) these conditions were fulfilled only five times, in the years 1375 (the moon left Leo 29 July), 1377 (5 Aug.), 1380 (2 Aug.), 1383 (31 July), 1385 (6 Aug.).<sup>22</sup> The main point is this. The conditions were not fulfilled in 1387, as we have seen; nor in 1386, for though the moon left Leo 28 July, Venus was too near the sun ( $5^{\circ}$ - $10^{\circ}$ ) to be visible, especially after actual nightfall.<sup>23</sup> Therefore if Mr. Root is correct

<sup>20</sup> iv, 1320, 1328, 1592, 1595, etc., etc.; v, 842.

<sup>21</sup> "Horned newe" (v, 650, 657); it is invisible, the sun being well on in the same sign.

<sup>22</sup> Strictly speaking, probably some of even these possibilities should be dropped, since the moon may have left Leo before nightfall; but with the moon invisible, these estimates are likely to be as accurate as any made by Chaucer, and for other reasons it does not matter. The day he refers to cannot be much earlier than the above days, since the moon traverses a sign in about two days and a quarter. All the days of the month mentioned in this discussion are according to our Gregorian calendar, not to Chaucer's calendar, which of course was the Julian, and to fit which we must subtract nine days from the Gregorian date; but this fact is insignificant for us, since all are Gregorian, and especially since the poet here never names the month or the day. For the reckonings involved above, the chief help was found in P. V. Neugebauer, *Tafeln f. Sonne, Planeten u. Mond* (4000 B. C.-3000 A. D.), Leipzig, 1914.

<sup>23</sup> The same is the case with 1378.

in believing <sup>24</sup> that Chaucer wrote III, 624-628, in May, 1385, or a trifle earlier, and that the poem was finished "between the spring of 1385 and the summer of 1387," — and *if* in v, 1016-20, he also portrays something he had just seen, he wrote most of the third book, the fourth, and most of the fifth, about 4000 lines or half this very finished poem, about a ninth of all his surviving poetry, in less than three months, or (to use Mr. Root's leeway of two or three months earlier) in less than five or six months.<sup>25</sup> I do not regard this reasoning as at all conclusive, simply because there is another explanation than recent observation for the insertion of the second passage. Hardly astrology, as in Mr. Root's case; for we do not know, among other things, in what part of Leo the sun is, or in what sign Venus is. I mean the extreme beauty of the imagery, and the grandeur of any broad picture of the heavenly bodies, and the fact that the medievals constantly thought of their positions. Celestial configurations were probably invented as well as observed by Chaucer; a fact sometimes minimized by modern students desirous of finding evidence as to the chronology of his writings. The configuration is not usually so rare as in Mr. Root's case. The present case either serves a warning on any modern astrologers, or else (may one say?) pretty nearly disproves Mr. Root's date.

The writing of about half the *Troilus* in less than three months, or than five or six, unlikely in any case, is in the highest degree unlikely in view of the circumstances of the poet's life at the time.<sup>26</sup> Hardly any part of his life is less inviting than 1385-6 to crowd with literary work. He was allowed the rare favor of a deputy at

<sup>24</sup> Pp. 55-6, 62.

<sup>25</sup> If anyone demands more leeway than this, he might as well grant several years.

<sup>26</sup> Professor Kittredge (*Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, p. 37) thinks even two years manifestly too short a time for writing the entire *Troilus*. The two years he discusses were years of routine work. It would be absurd to seek nicely calculated less and more in Chaucer's leisure for writing, but one further thing may be noted. The fact that during more than thirty years he both continued to produce with some steadiness highly original, finished and learned poetry, and yet simultaneously carried on a great variety of responsible and practical occupations, shows that these occupations were not steadily exacting or intense. It would be hard really to parallel such a career in the whole history of English poetry; it is a vast tribute to Chaucer's vitality and genius.

the custom-house from 17 February; he was appointed justice-of-the-peace for Kent, a really important and distinguished office, 12 October; he became knight of the shire for Kent in August, 1386, and his expenses for serving were paid 28 Nov., 1386; he had vacated his London house before 5 October of that year.<sup>27</sup> From all this the inevitable conclusion is drawn that by the middle of 1385 he was established in Kent; and that he was soon established socially as well as physically is to be presumed through his so soon receiving these two offices, known to be then considerable. Pulling up roots in one community yet probably maintaining some relations with it, and rapid putting down roots in another, hardly favor the lonely and intense preoccupation of a poet. Mr. Root judiciously declines to set a rate for Chaucer's literary production; anything is possible; but a poet who averaged about a thousand verses a year does not seem likely in these circumstances to have written the *Troilus* so fast, or in these two years (from early 1385 to the middle, or earlier, of 1387) to have written between five or six thousand and nine or ten thousand of his best.<sup>28</sup>

As to an early date for the *Troilus*, Professor Kittredge's searching *Date of Chaucer's Troilus* would convince anybody that much that has been said for it must be abandoned; in particular, any entire conviction that Gower in 1377 must have alluded to the poem I would fain 'revoke in my retracciouns,' and I would modify other arguments.<sup>29</sup> But I would also revive from the obscurity of a foot-

<sup>27</sup> *Life-Records* (Ch. Soc.); J. R. Hulbert, *Chaucer's Official Life* (Menasha, 1912), p. 64; Manly, *New Light*, pp. 35-7; *Anglia*, xxxvii, 19.

<sup>28</sup> Depending on whether *Palamon-Knight's Tale* comes before or after *Troilus*, and the *Legends* before or after their prolog. The minimum is some 4800 lines of the *Troilus* and a considerable part of the *Legend*. Personally I should put the first-named, and not the legends, between their prolog and the *Troilus*.

<sup>29</sup> But I should like to recall E. K. Rand's acute hint in *Speculum*, i, 225. The mysterious Lollius (of whatever origin) figures repeatedly in *Troilus* as a 'lawful literary device' for securing respectable ancestry for the story. He appears also in the *House of Fame* (l. 1468) along with five renowned writers on the Trojans,—Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido, and 'Englyssh Gaufride.' This last is usually taken for Geoffrey of Monmouth. I hate to think of his feelings at being called English, and even from Chaucer should expect 'Britoun Gaufride' (like 'Bret Glascursion' in the same hall of Fame, l. 1208). Further, Geoffrey of Monmouth is a far-fetched explanation; properly, he is not 'bisy for to bere up Troye' as the first four are, but merely pursues the later history of certain of the Trojans'

note <sup>30</sup> what is almost a proof that the *Palamon*, which we call the *Knight's Tale* (unless revised in the middle), was written after the *Troilus*. The name Dane (for Daphne) occurs but twice in Chaucer's works. In *TC* III, 726, the poet has "whan Dane hire-selven shette," for which nearly a quarter of the earliest texts read *Diane*, as one might expect of many scribes. Evidently annoyed by this error, in *Kn T* 2062-4 with grotesque candor the poet, mentioning Dane, breaks out, "I mene nat . . . Diane, But . . . Dane." This is much more surprising than the verse about the A.<sup>31</sup> Naturally the *Dane* passage (which certainly cannot be proved a revision, — it is in harmony with the often light tone of the poem) where Chaucer takes his impatient precaution is the second. If the *Palamon* or *Knight's Tale* came between the *Troilus* and the *Legend*, the crowding of these few years becomes still harder to accept. There is also Miss Bressie's weighty, if not absolutely convincing, argument <sup>32</sup> for 1384-5 as the date of Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love*, which quotes, names, and shows great intimacy with the *Troilus* (as well as the *House of Fame* and Chaucer's *Boethius*). Mr. Robinson (p. 922) suggests that Usk knew *Troilus* before it was finished. But the trouble is that Usk's most striking citation is from the revised version of *Troilus* <sup>33</sup> (as no editor notes); did then Chaucer communicate, to a man whom

descendants in the fourth generation. In 'Englyssh Gaufride' how about a homeward glance at Geoffrey Chaucer, if he had lately written *Troilus*? Evidently *Troilus* is not immediately before the *Legend* (1386) if it is found that other long poems intervened.

<sup>30</sup> Tatlock, *Scene of Fkl. T. Visited* (Ch. Soc.), p. 36.

<sup>31</sup> There is no good parallel to it even where the Pardoner (l. 585) in his harangue to the ignorant says he means "nat Samuel, but Lamuel."

<sup>32</sup> *MP.*, xxvi, 17-29.

<sup>33</sup> *IV*, 967-80, etc., 997-1001, etc. (for the proof that the passage appeared first, and latish, in the revision, see Root, *Tr. and Cr.*, pp. lxxi f., 517; *Textual Trad. of Ch's. Tr.*, Ch. Soc., 1916, pp. 216-20); *Test. of Love*, III, iv, ll. 237-8 (relation of foreknowledge to free-will), 242-3 (to the future), 254, 259 (*Troilus* named), in Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, VII, 123, and mostly quoted in Tatlock, *Devel. and Chronol. of Ch's. Works*, pp. 20-1. It is perfectly true that the matter is in Boethius, who is much used by Usk, but the point is that he cites it from *Troilus*—"the noble philosophical poete in Englissh . . . , in a tretis that he made of . . . Troilus, hath this mater touched. . . . In the boke of Troilus, the answer to thy question mayst thou lerne." The matter is touched nowhere else in the *Troilus*. The reminiscence is certain.

there is no certainty that he knew and no probability that he was close to, a *revised* edition of book iv before he wrote book III? If Miss Bressie's date for the *Testament* is correct, the date 1385 for the *Troilus* seems impossible. Even if we accept the latest date for the *Testament*, 1387, the former seems again crowding things. It is quite true that the revision might have been done in a month or two, but, directly after completing and publishing so finished a poem as *Troilus*, the poet is not likely at once to have set about extensively and minutely revising it. This was my meaning earlier in saying that the revision "implies the passage of a number of years."

Nor are we compelled to see anything in the literary quality of the *Troilus* inconsistent with Chaucer at thirty-five or forty; especially at a time when people matured early, — when women were marriageable at twelve,<sup>84</sup> and males at fourteen or fifteen, and were campaigning or the like at a similar age or even as young as twelve.<sup>85</sup> Its source the *Filostrato* was written when Boccaccio was in the mid-twenties; in Latin symmetry superior, in compass, insight, depth, and power it is vastly inferior to the *Troilus*. But though this cannot be proved in brief, literary history is full of highly mature works comparable to *Troilus* written even today "nel mezzo del cammin." The difficulty for some doubtless lies not in Chaucer's early age but in a very early position among his works, a rapid growth from the light French manner to complex

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Kittredge, *Engl. Stud.*, XIII, 20; and Tatlock, *Devel. and Chronol.*, p. 154; G. G. Coulton, *Ch. and his Engl.*, p. 204. The daughter of Grisildis (not to mention the Wife of Bath) is marriageable at twelve (*CT* 736); Goldeborw is to be married at twelve (*Havelok*, l. 192); Brunhild is twelve before she plights her troth (*Corp. Poet. Boreale*, I, 304); the Blessed Virgin was fourteen (*Cursor Mundi*, l. 20824), and Merlin's mother fifteen when they conceived (Lawman's *Hist. Brit.*, 15701); it is high time for a girl to marry at fifteen (*'Tis Merry When Gossips Meet*, Hunterian Club, no. 30, p. 29).

<sup>85</sup> Tatlock, *Devel. and Chronol.*, pp. 149-50; Michaud, *Biogr. Univers.* (Paris, 1811-), V, 280; J. H. Ramsay, *Angevin Emp.*, p. 344; Froissart (ed. K. de Lettenhove), IV, 377; Lawman, l. 19900; Wace's *Brut*, l. 9247; J. L. Weston, *Sir Percival*, I, 244; *Corp. Poet. Bor.*, I, 351, II, 94, 178, 189; Saxo Grammaticus (tr. and ed. O. Elton and F. Y. Powell), pp. xxv, 366; and abundantly in Scandinavian tradition (*Heimskringla*, *Grettissaga*, etc.). Some of this of course is historically unreliable, but it was acceptable to medievals, and is not the mere infant-prodigy exaggeration of the folk-tale.

reality. No doubt it is this feeling which *de facto* has disposed some moderns to look with kindly eye on dubious arguments and even wild surmise. If we expect to see a poet's development unrolled simply and plainly before us, there are several things to mitigate the difficulty (if such it is). We know some of Chaucer's works are lost, and some he may have suppressed. Poetic growth is a function less of ascertainable training and practise than of development of personality, which is untraceable. Worthy as the *Troilus* is of Chaucer's "best period," we do not know when this was; he may have had more than one best period. *A priori* views in history are notoriously hazardous. We need not hold with Mr. Robinson (p. 452) that the chronology of Chaucer's poems might almost be based on their varying degrees of complication, for this assuredly was not always determined by date; it is equally possible to hold that his manner and achievement varied rather with the character of his subject. Is not the *Legend* far simpler and less mature-seeming than *Troilus*? Mr. Robinson appears to think so;<sup>86</sup> and how about his opinion of *Phys T* (pp. 10, 832), and how about *Manc T*, which at the earliest is not very early, being in ten-syllable couplets? The fact is that the *Troilus*, while full of Chaucer's mature and characteristic traits, is quite different in kind from anything else he wrote; it does not stand in the course of his main line of growth; he had not struck his pace or found his bent; he never again essayed so lofty, ambitious and finished a work (unless to a degree in the *Man of Law's Tale*). This is undoubtedly why Sir Philip Sidney in the *Apology for Poetry* gives the *Troilus* high praise, and markedly ignores the rest of his works. Of this fundamental difference, unnoticed by some moderns, Sidney was acutely conscious, and so was Chaucer himself. As I see it, after his apprenticeship in the French medieval manner, Chaucer in the *Troilus* tried his genius in the Italian-Latin more elaborate and formal manner (though without entirely representing his own personality). He then felt a more informal way to be the way for him; he returned to it with a new critical freedom after his experience outside it. Freedom and expression of his own personality are the mark of the *House of Fame* and the *Legend*. All this is har-

<sup>86</sup> P. 566. He favors the view that the legends were written before the prologue, apparently even before the *Troilus* (pp. 449, 566, 953); but since they were written as amends for the latter, is it not odd that they should precede it?



monious with an early period for *Troilus*. I am arguing here for no special date, merely emphasizing doubt as to a late one. It is permitted to regard the date as still unsettled, and so it may remain unless someone finds an indubitable borrowing in the poem, or from it, from or in some nearly contemporary work of indubitable dating.

## II

*The Friar's Order.* Chaucer does not make clear what order his Friar belongs to; and he gives divergent hints. It would be natural that the friar mocked by the Sumner in his tale should be of the same order as the latter's enemy the Friar with whom he is so grievously wroth; but this would seem not to be the case. The friar in the *Sumner's Tale* is probably a Carmelite. This order claimed as founder the prophet Elijah, and the notion that it was derived from a sort of monastic community supposed founded by him on Mount Carmel, still a *pia opinio*, was taken very seriously indeed in the middle ages. Even in the early sixteenth century John Bale called his book on the English Carmelites *Anglorum Heliades* (sons of Elijah). Now in the discourse of the Sumner's friar, Elijah appears twice, and his disciple Elisha once (almost the only times they appear in Chaucer's works), as precedents for friars' virtues; Elijah fasted and contemplated (ll. 1890-3; the Carmelites were and are known as an especially contemplative order), and (2116-8),

‘syn that Elye was, or Elise,  
Han freres been, that fynde I of record,  
In charitee, ythanked be our Lord!’

With the strong rivalry among the orders, it seems unlikely that Chaucer would have thought of a member of another order as thus celebrating the earliest Carmelites.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>37</sup> So also says Skeat, *Oxf. Chaucer*, v, 339. On the other hand, some details seem contradictory or otherwise vague and inaccurate. Jankin (though hardly an eminent authority: l. 2259) declares that a convent contains thirteen; I find such a regulation in no order, and among the Carmelites any figures discoverable contradict this (*Carmel: Its History, Spirit, and Saints*, by the Discalced Carmelites of Boston and Santa Clara, N. Y., 1927, pp. 196, 213; I owe thanks for the book to the Rev. Mother Augustine, prioress of the latter convent). Jankin had no better reason for his twelve than the twelve spokes of his cart-wheel. The noble usage he

The Friar among the pilgrims, on the other hand, according to such hints as there are, did not belong to this order. If he is a Franciscan there is a specially keen stroke of sarcasm in the fact that he knew purveyors of good cheer (*Prolog.*, 242-7)

Bet than a lazar or a beggestere;  
 For unto swich a worthy man as he  
 Acorded nat, as by his facultee,  
 To have with sike lazars aqueyntaunce.  
 It is nat honest, it may nat avaunce,  
 For to deelen with no swich poraille,  
 But al with riche and selleres of vitaille.

However much in course of time the orders approximated each other, the Franciscans were founded particularly to minister to the poor, and St. Francis laid the utmost stress on humility for his "Fratres Minores"; and as to lepers, his almost sensational tenderness and service to them is renowned, was urged by him on his friars, and is recorded at the beginning of his *Testamentum*, in the *Fioretti*, the *Speculum Perfectionis*, and early and modern biographies, and was imitated by his early followers and by such early Franciscan "tertiaries" as St. Elizabeth of Hungary.<sup>38</sup> In so long

tells of for serving the worthiest first at table (2278-9) is common enough everywhere; except I am told among the Dominicans, owing to a tradition in the order. This friar's order issues letters of fraternity with seals to the laity in the world (ll. 2126-8); but Carmelite tertiaryes were not established till 1476 (*Carmel*, p. 44); some sort of lay associates however may have been known before (p. 211). I find no parallel in any order, or anywhere (in spite of the commentators), for "Deus hic" (l. 1770) on entering a house; "Pax huic domui" is the regular liturgical phrase. But other phrases may have been used informally, as here. If more important matters were consistent, we might detect ironical Franciscan allusions in *Summ T.* In the Franciscan Rule (no. 3; St. Francis' *Opera Omnia*, Cologne, 1849, p. 76), merely in order not to cause trouble, a brother may eat what is set before him in another's house; as to food the Sumner's friar had his strong preferences, which he emphatically conveyed (1839-43). This friar's appropriation to his brethren (1919-26) of the beatitude "Beati pauperes spiritu," though fitting enough to any mendicant order, might be an echo of the saint's enlargement on it, for the edification of his followers, in the *Admonitio*, cap. 13 (*ib.*, pp. 29-30). But all these points are probably insignificant.

<sup>38</sup> *Fioretti*, cap. 25; *Spec. Perf.*, capp. 44, 58; *Actus B. Franc. et Soc. Ejus* (ed. P. Sabatier, Paris, 1902), pp. 93-6; *Opera Omnia* (Cologne, 1849), p. 45. St. Louis, an admirer of the mendicant orders, also tended

and cleancut a passage as that quoted it is natural to detect a sarcastic comparison between the Friar and his "father" St. Francis. On the whole, if Chaucer had not yet forgotten the Franciscan friar whom the probable tradition says he beat up in Fleet St.,<sup>39</sup> he does not make his spiritual chastisement of these brethren at all unmistakable. Yet there is much more suggestion of a Franciscan than of a Carmelite.

The same uncertain conclusion is favored by the picture of the Friar of the pilgrimage by the very careful and intelligent artist who illustrated the Ellesmere MS a very few years after Chaucer's death. The character and colors of friars' habits were and are, it is true, not as invariable as some have thought; and so I am told by modern friars. But in this picture there is no suggestion of a Franciscan or Carmelite; the man wears shoes not sandals,<sup>40</sup> has no cord about his waist, and his frock is neither grey nor brown. Its clear black color, with several indications of white beneath, suggests rather a Dominican or Augustinian, but neither by any means perfectly. Similar solecisms are committed by the modern

lepers (Guill. de St. Pathus, *Vie de St. Louis*, "Coll. de Textes pour Servir . . .," xxvii, 108). An appealing work of charity and mortification, it was confined to no group.

<sup>39</sup> J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (N. Y., 1926), pp. 8 ff.; E. Rickert, in *Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923), pp. 20 ff. Franciscan houses were not enough more numerous than others in medieval England to establish any presumption for a Franciscan (Dugdale, *Monasticon* [1830], vi, iii, 1482 ff., additions by Caley, Ellis, etc., records them in some 66 places, Dominican in some 58, Carmelite in 40-50, Austin in over 40; Manly's figures in *Cant. T.*, p. 511, are not very different). The Friar's semi-cope suggests seemingly no order but the Carmelites, who have always worn over a brown frock a white mantle to the knee (whence the nickname White Friars), but a short cloak cannot be proved as never worn by others. (So *Carmel*, frontispiece and p. 25; and E. Markert, *Chaucers Canterbury-Pilger u. ihre Tracht*, Würzburg, 1911, p. 48, who suggests possibly also the Austins). While it was and still is customary for any friars to go about by twos till of ripe age (as the Sumner's friar does and says, ll. 1778, 1862), probably any friar could receive dispensation to go alone on a pilgrimage; but it has been doubted if a Franciscan would have been allowed such grandeur as to ride a horse. On the whole it is risky to apply the Rules or even custom to particular cases; dispensations, lax discipline and casual variation are too common.

<sup>40</sup> But sandals were not universal; in *Peres Plowman's Crede*, 299, an Austin friar mocks the Franciscans for wearing buckled shoes against their rule.

cartoonist in portraying the officiant (say) at a wedding. This artist, who throughout shows the accuracy with which he had read the *Prologue*, found no guidance in this case, and portrays here the genus, not a species.

Sound conclusions are that the Sumner's friar seems to be a Carmelite; that in describing the Friar on the pilgrimage Chaucer may have thought specially of the Franciscans; and that therefore, natural as we have seen it to be that the two should be of the same order, Chaucer made no attempt to show that they were, or plainly to label either. And there is no strong presumption that he would do so. Far be it to belittle Chaucer's reality and dramatic aptness; they can be readily seen on every second page, and have been brilliantly exhibited by modern scholars where the casual reader does not suspect them. But it seems better not to force things where the indications are adverse. A busy man of affairs composed the *Canterbury Tales* during the spare time of probably thirteen years and more, — the *Prologue* and the *Sumner's Tale* perhaps quite a number of years apart. We know that he did not invariably look back when he should, and seemingly revised the *Tales* but little. Further, in spite of the eminence of some, the friars loomed largest in the life of the humbler classes. While surely Chaucer must have known some of the differences among the orders, he may not have known every detail, any more than in 1918 we distinguished all military insignia, and his complete contempt for his friars allows us to suppose that he disregarded differences. He gives a composite picture. He had in mind the *genus Frater* rather than a species, or, as the Parson might say, the root rather than the branches. This clear case has been worth enlarging on because moderns are sometimes tempted to go too far in attributing realistic finish to his poems, and especially in treating him as if he were not a poet but a historian. A friar in life would have to belong to some order, but not a friar in the imagination. Sometimes Chaucer's imagination went to the limit, sometimes not.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>41</sup> I am only sorry that I am forced to part company with Mr. Manly. In that book which has so illuminated Chaucer's backgrounds, and added so many strokes to his portrait, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (pp. 102-22), he has some things on this subject which are hard to accept and even at times to understand. The Sumner's friar he believes certainly a Franciscan (p. 118). After what has been said above, what evidence is there for this? Even if the Friar of the *Prologue* were certainly a Franciscan, there is none in the mere assumptions that the Friar's and Sumner's quarrel was

## III

"*Heeld the space*" (*Prol.*, 176). In "heeld after the newe world the space" (said of the Monk) some editors' parenthetical adverbial *meanwhile*<sup>42</sup> for the last phrase seems unparalleled, and clumsier than Skeat's *course*. In classical Latin *spatium* means course, race, race-course or track, and *spatior* means walk or go. In medieval Latin *spatium* and *spatiamentum* mean going about,

of long standing (pp. 102-3), and that they came from the same part of the country, and that the *Friar's Tale* is set in the north (p. 103), as the *Sumner's* of course is. On the contrary, it seems to be far away from the north country (ll. 1413-4, 1397, 1401); and I am surprised that Mr. Manly sees any northern dialect in the tale, since almost if not quite all the words he cites from it as northern (p. 106) are found in midland writers and sometimes elsewhere in Chaucer, as can easily be proved. I am quite mystified here, and at other things. There is no evidence that the Sumner is chastising the Franciscans in the fact that just as the Holderness convent of the Sumner's friar is building (ll. 1977, 2099-2106), so the only house of Franciscans in Holderness had been building—more than a generation earlier (pp. 104-5; see *Vict. Co. Hist.*, Yorks, III, 285). On the other hand, there were two Carmelite houses in Holderness in Chaucer's day or shortly before (at Kingston and Sutton, both close to Hull,—Dugdale, *Monast.*, VI, iii, 1581-2; see Manly, pp. 104, 119-20), besides at least three elsewhere in Yorkshire; I do not venture to say whether Chaucer was acquainted with any of them.

Nor can I imagine who has suggested that the Sumner's friar was of the Cistercian order (p. 104), who were not friars at all but reformed Benedictine monks; has someone been misled by the fact that they were called "gray monks," just as the Franciscans were the Gray Friars? All will remember the "friar of orders gray"; they are "fratres griseos" in a fourteenth-century English macaronic poem in the *Monumenta Franciscana* (Rolls Ser., p. 595). The Franciscans did not wear brown habitually till centuries later; so far as I find, the brown frock has been more characteristic of the Carmelites.

As to the Friar on the pilgrimage, no more do I know the reason for the fundamentally puzzling idea (p. 104, posteriorly) that "the scurrilous anecdote of the Summoner's prologue certainly proves" him "to have been a Franciscan," though Chaucer shows no *viscera misericordiae* for this order, nor would have minded rumpling their feelings. There is no increment of evidence here. I note finally that the well-favored parallel to this anecdote which has been told of the Cistercians (*MLN.*, XXIX, 143) has been told also of the Dominicans in their *Vitae Fratrum*, I, 5 (tr. and ed. F. Conway and B. Jarrett, London, 1924).

<sup>42</sup> *NED.* gives only *mean space* as signifying meanwhile,—a very different thing. One may ask,—the space of what?

recreation, even in hunting,<sup>43</sup> some of this paralleled in French, Italian, even German. In *Troilus*, v, 1791, some of the best MSS have *space*, a reading adopted by Mr. Root, meaning pass along.<sup>44</sup> It seems best to suppose that *space* meaning course existed in Chaucer's day, but in any case in the polyglot middle ages usages passed readily from one language to another.

*Undermeles* (WBT 875). There is no reason to doubt that *undern*, *undermeel*, always in Chaucer mean the later morning, never afternoon.<sup>45</sup> *Undern* later came to mean afternoon, for in the leisurely clockless middle ages times of day were vague and varying; people got up very early, and, further, midday was not so marked a point as in our life. But in Chaucer *undern* seems always to mean about the time of tierce the breviary-office; almost without time-pieces, but rarely out of earshot of convent-bells, the medievals depended on them for the time of day. In the line "In undermeles and in morwenynges" (WBT 875) some have been misled by the last word, which does not mean mornings but very early mornings, the time when morn is arriving.<sup>46</sup> The chronology of the medieval day is an inviting subject to look into.

*The Bishop's Hook* (Fri T 1317). All readers do not get the sarcasm in the Friar's "er the bisshop caughte hem with his hook" (the laity, with the purpose of fleecing them). The crozier is a "pastoral" staff, like a shepherd's for drawing back the sheep from peril, as was well known. Skeat and Manly<sup>47</sup> aptly cite *Piers Plowman*, where the crozier "Is hoked on that one ende to halie men fro helle" (B, VIII, 95), and it is the spike on the other end which is to strike down the wicked. In delivering to a new-made bishop "*baculum pastoralis officii*" the metropolitan warned him to be "*sine ira*," "*misericordie reminiscens*"; the pastoral symbolism is still clearer after Chaucer's day, in the earliest English pontifical, of 1549, where in delivering the crozier the archbishop

<sup>43</sup> Ducange; and see Regino of Prüm in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS, I, 600 (var.).

<sup>44</sup> A sense amply illustrated in the sixteenth century by NED. Many of the MSS by their alteration show that this sense in the *Prolog.* passage, if unusual, was clear.

<sup>45</sup> As taken by some editors and by the NED. Manly and the *Globe* edition have it as above, though without explanation.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. also Root on the meaning of *by the morwe* (MLN., XLIV, 496).

<sup>47</sup> *Cant. T.* (N. Y., 1928), p. 587.

says, "Be to the flocke of Christ a shepeheard, not a wolfe; feede them, deuoure them not." The idea had been familiar for centuries.<sup>48</sup>

*The Merchant's Tale for the Monk?* The present writer once thought the *Merchant's Tale* first written for the Monk, but at the suasion of Professor Kittredge abandoned the idea, which has lately been revived. Ll. 1347, 1384 contain no evidence perceptible to some; in 1390 and 2055 *worldly* seems to mean not secular but merely living on earth, as usually in Chaucer; and 1251, 1322 (insipid in the mouth of a cleric, in so intense and subtle a tale) contain merely a covert sneer at the clergy as no chaster than the laity.<sup>49</sup> The frankness of the Merchant's prolog (1213-44, which was certainly written for him) is startling at first in the canny, reserved Merchant of the *Prologue*, but in neither his prolog nor his tale is it easy to see anything contradicting his character; this controlled savagery among strangers of a restrained personality when touched to the quick seems rather exquisitely life-like,—*in meditatione sua exarsit ignis, et locutus est in lingua sua*. Why should the easy-going Monk feel so intensely? <sup>50</sup> In any case, with a work composed as the *Tales* were, we cannot expect and certainly do not always get extreme nicety in fitting distant parts to each other, as has been shown many times.

*The Horseman in the Hall* (*Sq T* 80-1). A horseman riding into a large building was common enough on occasions in real life, at a time when floors were on the ground-level and cellars rare. The King's Champion, offering combat to the disloyal, was a feature of coronation-banquets, even including that of George IV in 1821, though never thereafter; on that occasion he rode into Westminster Hall (presumably down an inclined plane), and his horse, trained to back out before His Majesty, backed in, to the mirth of the spectators. Without pausing over this pretty con-

<sup>48</sup> *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXII, 610, CLXXVII, 354, COXIII, 80.

<sup>49</sup> This is specially natural if *Mch T* was written as a retort to *ShipmT*, then meant for the Wife of Bath. The Merchant's chief foe was she, but flings at the incontinent monk in that tale would be natural to a teller who was bitterly running amuck at everybody. See *Anglia*, XXXVII, 94.

<sup>50</sup> Mr. Manly (pp. 635-6) thinks the Monk in his prolog sedate and bookish, and altogether different from him of the *General Prologue*; Mr. Robinson (p. 13) gives the essentials of a possibly more living picture. But assuredly neither view harmonizes with *Mch T*.

junction of the First Gentleman in Europe and Cambyuscan, I add that John Stow tells of a horsewoman riding in there in 1316, at Edward II's solemn Whitsun feast (like Cambyuscan's birthday feast), as well as of horsemen there at other times.<sup>51</sup> All will remember the cavalcade of the Feast of Asses in medieval churches. At Warwick Castle is a hall into which it is said horsemen used to ride. At a local festival held to this day (1930 and 1931) at Arles, horsemen ride into the hall even of a modern hotel to collect money.

*The Manciple's "My sone."* The *my sone*<sup>52</sup> which appears constantly in the Manciple's sage advice (ll. 318-9, 321-2, etc., etc.) is perhaps not especially due to Solomon's Proverbs (where the case is different), but to collections of gnomic sayings in various languages; who could so fittingly advise about the conduct of life as a parent to a child? This address appears many times in the *Disticha Catonis* (and versions in French and English), in Petrus Alphonsus, the *Proverbs of Alfred*, and other places.<sup>53</sup> The combination of the popular *my dame* (my mother, l. 317) and *my sone*, points to no specific source; one may guess that Chaucer had many collections in mind, including word-of-mouth lore among the people.

J. S. P. TATLOCK

*University of California*

---

### THE SO-CALLED PROLOGUE TO THE *KNIGHT'S TALE*

We have Chaucer's word for it in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* (F 420) that he had already written a romance of "the love of Palamon and Arcite," and Professor Tatlock has demonstrated conclusively that this poem was substantially the

<sup>51</sup> M. F. Johnston, *Coronation of a King* (London, 1902), pp. 8, 9 (with a picture), 141, and J. F. Round, *The King's Serjeants* (London, 1911), pp. 379, 387; and see the account of Westminster Hall in Stow's *London*. Here as in other cases (pp. 823, l. 80; 927, l. 548; 929, l. 976) Mr. Robinson seems to emphasize the poet's relation to literature where one might think also of contemporary life.

<sup>52</sup> Robinson, pp. 872, 870; the last point in his admirable commentary to be remarked on.

<sup>53</sup> *Anglia*, VII; *Erlanger Beitr.*, II; EETS., OS, 117; etc., etc.



same as that which was afterwards included in the Canterbury collection as the *Knight's Tale*. But, as Professor Tatlock recognizes, "some slight changes must have been made in the course of fitting the story of *Palamon and Arcite* into its context in the Canterbury series.

A passage near the beginning, ll. 889-892, which allude to the pilgrims and the supper, must be new, and probably the whole paragraph 875-892. At the end there is nothing which must be new except the very last line, a benediction on the "fair company:" yet the ending is so brisk and succinct that it gives countenance to my belief that the poem was never finished in its original form and that the whole present ending was made for the *Canterbury Tales*. Elsewhere I find not the least indication of adaptation or alteration.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Tatlock was here occupied primarily in refuting the theory of a lost stanzaic *Palamon and Arcite*, and left it undecided whether the inserted passage near the beginning of the *Knight's Tale* consisted of four or eighteen lines.

It is my purpose in the present paper by a detailed examination

<sup>1</sup> J. S. P. Tatlock, *Dev. and Chron. of Chaucer's Works*, Chaucer Soc. (1907), p. 66. So far as the conclusion of the poem is concerned, the assumption that Chaucer altered his earlier text was not perhaps strictly necessary, for the line "God save al this faire compaignye!" (A 3108) may not be a specific reference to the Canterbury pilgrims. Most medieval romances conclude with some formula of benediction, and even the use of the word *compaignye* does not assure us that the story was addressed to a company of pilgrims. Compare, for example, the conclusion of *Sir Amadace*:

Jhesu Criste in Trinite  
Blesse and glade this *cumpany*  
And ore us halde his hande.

It may also be remarked that the body of the Tale has not even been adapted to oral rendition. It is true that the words *tellen*, *tale*, and *seyen* occur frequently, but these are also used in *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Romaunt of the Rose*, where there is no idea of a character narrating the poems. In fact, the one hint in the body of the Tale which suggests any particular mode of rendition is the line, "And of this storie list me nat to wryte" (A 1201). This seems to represent a clear oversight on Chaucer's part when he added the *Palamon* to the *Canterbury Tales*. But in all fairness to Chaucer it should be said that on one occasion he uses *writen* figuratively ("This white top writeth myne olde yeris" *Pro RvT* A 3869) and on another he employs it in the midst of a passage of purely framework material ("After the which this murye tale I write" *Pro Mel* B 2154). The latter instance seems to cast doubt upon the common notion that Chaucer always and consistently thought of himself as a dramatic artist.

of the text to point out some definite indications that the entire second paragraph of the Tale, consisting of lines 875-892, was added by Chaucer at the time he incorporated the *Palamon* in the Canterbury collection. The question has some chronological interest, for within this paragraph occurs a line which is supposed to introduce an allusion to the arrival of Anne of Bohemia in England, and accordingly is taken to fix the composition of the poem soon after December 1381. However, if this paragraph was a later addition, the reference would not date the composition of the *Palamon*, but merely its insertion into the Canterbury framework. Moreover, as I shall endeavor to show presently, the line in question really contains no contemporary allusion and therefore is without chronological significance.

We may conveniently begin our examination with the unmistakable reference to the pilgrims and the supper in lines 889-892:

I wol nat letten eek noon of this route;  
 Lat every felawe telle his tale aboute  
 And lat se now who shal the soper wynne  
 And ther I lefte, I wol ayeyn bigynne.<sup>2</sup>

It is clear not only that these lines could not have stood in the earlier *Palamon*, but also that they mark the conclusion of the inserted passage inasmuch as at this point the thread of the narrative is again taken up.

Confirmatory evidence that the insertion ended at this point is afforded by thirteen MSS. Five of them expressly designate the thirty-four lines which extend to the end of this passage as a prologue of the Tale. At line 893, twelve MSS bear the rubric, "Heere bigynneth the Knyghtes tale" or "*incipit narracio*," and still another MS (Harley 1239) begins the text of the Tale at this point. In marking the beginning of the Tale at line 893 these thirteen scribes were obviously mistaken, for the preceding lines contain elements necessary to an understanding of the story. But they were evidently impressed by the decided break in the narrative which occurs at this point.

On the other hand, the four lines quoted above show no lack of

<sup>2</sup>In two MSS (Cardigan and Manchester) just these four lines are omitted. Both these MSS, however, range themselves definitely among the "edited" MSS of the *Canterbury Tales* and therefore cannot be appealed to as preserving an earlier textual tradition.

continuity with those which immediately precede. The Knight has stated that he will omit certain details because he has a long story to tell. This makes it natural for him to add that he does not wish to "let" the other members of the company by the length of his tale. Without these four lines, his complaint as to the length of his story and the weakness of the oxen in his plough sounds like that of a person who is thinking chiefly of the expenditure of energy which the telling of his long tale will cost him. His statement that he does not propose to be inconsiderate of his fellow-pilgrims is, therefore, the logical culmination of what has gone before. It is thus obvious that the inserted passage did not begin with the four lines cited above.

A significant indication of the point at which the inserted passage began is disclosed by the shift of tenses between lines 873 and 876. Down to line 874 the *Knight's Tale* employs a logical use of verbal forms—past for events of the narrative and present for the time of narrating them:

*Lete* I this noble due to Atthenes ryde  
And al his hoost in armes hym bisyde (A 873-4).

But the text continues:

And certes, if it nere too long to heere,  
*I wolde have toold* you fully the manere (A 875-876)

The perfective form, *I wolde have toold you*, in place of the logical *I wolde tellen you* suggests that Chaucer was here inserting a kind of post script to an already completed work. At the end of this "post script" occurs another shift of tenses, though in this case a shift from preterit to present:

And ther I *lefte*, I wol ayeyn bigynne.  
This due, of whom I *make* mencioum (A 892 f)

Here instead of *make* we should have expected the form *made*. This shift restores the logical use of tenses interrupted by the introduction of the *wolde have toold* construction. Concrete verbal evidence, therefore, points to the conclusion that the inserted passage consisted of lines 875-892.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> One might object perhaps that the perfective tense in line 876 indicates merely that these matters have been mentioned a few lines before, and that Chaucer is conceiving of time as passing while the Knight is telling his

If we remove these eighteen lines, we find that nothing necessary to the understanding of the story is omitted, but that on the contrary the narrative is rendered considerably more consecutive. The opening of the Tale might then be summarized as follows: "Once upon a time Theseus conquered the Amazons and brought their queen home with him as his wife. Thus I let<sup>4</sup> this noble duke ride toward Athens in great state with all his armed host beside him. When this duke, of whom I am speaking, had come almost to Athens, he met with a strange disturbance amidst the general rejoicing—a group of noble ladies kneeling on the highway and making such moan as mortal man never heard before, etc." The original *Palamon* may well have begun in this fashion.

When Chaucer came to fit his earlier *Palamon* into the Canterbury collection as the *Knight's Tale* he contrived to introduce a reference to the Canterbury pilgrims, at the same time excusing himself for abridging the narrative by omitting details which stood in his sources. He also managed to illustrate the courtesy of the Knight, who here protests his unwillingness to disregard the rights of the other members of the company. Accordingly, Chaucer's eighteen-line insertion might be paraphrased as follows: "I would have gone into the opening events of my story fully if my Tale were not already too long as it is. I do not wish to interfere with the opportunity of the other members of the company

tale. But in that case why does the Knight say at line 893, "This duc, of whom I *make* mencion," using the present rather than the perfect for something mentioned eighteen lines before?

It might be argued that "lete I this noble duc" would seem to imply a change of subject matter, such as that furnished by the eighteen-line paragraph, thus making the digression organic to the opening of the Tale. It is true that *leten* is often used in the sense of "leave" to introduce a change of subject matter. But quite as often it indicates mere passage of time without any such change, e. g.

And thus I lete hem ete and drynke and pleye,  
This merchant and this monk, a day or tweye.

The thridde day, this merchant up ariseth (*ShipT* B 1263-5)

also *MchT* E 1965 ff., 2217 ff., *SqT* 290 ff. Thus Chaucer in the *Knight's Tale* wishes to indicate the time consumed by the journey of Theseus and Hippolyta from Scythia to a point on the road toward Athens. The presence of this lapse of time in Chaucer's conception of the story is perhaps responsible for inserting his "post script" at this exact point, for this was the most logical place for such an addition.

to tell their stories. Let everyone tell his tale in turn, and now let us see who will win the supper." This inserted passage is thus organic within itself, though it lacks organic relationship with its context.

Such an inorganic insertion is not unexampled in Chaucer's works. There is, for instance, a similar passage in the Prologue to the *Nun's Priest's Tale* (B 3961-80) which is generally considered, on the basis of internal and external evidence, to have been added at a later date. Apparently after Chaucer had already written a prologue to the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, he decided to place the *Monk's Tale* before it, and added a twenty-line passage in order to link this prologue with the last line of the *Monk's Tale*. These added lines were not placed at the beginning of the prologue, but were inserted between lines 4 and 5 of the earlier text, just as these eighteen lines were inserted between lines 16 and 17 of the *Palamon*.<sup>5</sup>

Let us now examine these eighteen lines in order to determine their relationship to the context. They consist essentially of two parts: a ten-line *occupatio*, followed by the eight lines containing the reference to the Canterbury framework. The following examination will concern itself with the first ten lines of the insertion.

After the first couplet (875-6) introducing the *occupatio*, these lines recount in orderly succession the incidents mentioned in the older *Palamon*, here preserved in the sections of the *Knight's Tale* immediately preceding and following the insertion. Light is accordingly thrown upon the meaning of the individual lines by referring to the lines in the surrounding passage which they repeat. The second couplet—

How wonnen was the regne of Femenye  
By Theseus and by his chivalrye (A 877 f.)—

---

<sup>5</sup> In the case of the *Pro NPT* variation in the MSS show clearly that the twenty lines are a later insertion. These variations are probably due to the fact that the lines occur in a link between two tales. In the case of the "prologue" of the *KnT*, on the other hand, the passage occurs within the tale itself. The greater divergence in the former case is to be expected; apparently many of the tales were circulated separately thus producing considerable textual variation in the MS authority of the links, and preserving more unified that of the tales.

directly parallels a couplet in the earlier stratum,

What with his wysdom and his chivalrie  
He conquered al the regne of Femenye (A 865 f.)

and covers the action in a long section of the first book of the *Teseide*. The third couplet elaborates upon the second one. The fourth,

And how asseged was Ypolita,  
The faire, hardy queene of Scithia (A 881 f.)

repeats material from various lines in the other portion of the Tale. The siege had been mentioned in line 866, and Scythia and Hippolyta in the following couplet:

That whilom was ycleped Scithia,  
And weddede the queene Ypolita (A 867 f.),

and the whole matter is treated more fully in the first book of the *Teseide*. Thus the close echo in lines 877-882 of material in the body of the Tale removes any possible doubt as to the incidents referred to and at the same time serves to establish Chaucer's method in the *occupatio*. It will be seen that the correspondence extends even to the use of the same riming words, *his chivalrie: the regne of Femenye*, ll. 865 f. and 877 f., and *Scithia: Ypolita*, ll. 867 f. and 881 f. Four riming expressions are thus repeated within eighteen lines of text.<sup>6</sup> It is difficult to believe that if these lines had been written continuously Chaucer would have repeated himself in this fashion.

Having noted the method employed in lines 877-882, we proceed to consider the fifth and last couplet of these ten lines:

And of the feste that was at hir weddyngge,  
And of the tempest at hir hoom-comyngge (A 883 f.)

Here again matters are referred to which have already been mentioned in the Tale. But the particular sense in which certain words in this couplet are used may be open to question. *Feste*, for example, could mean either a specific feast or a general festivity

<sup>6</sup> Nowhere else in Chaucer is there quite such a striking instance of repetition. Cases of four riming words within passages of 22 lines may be noted in *Pro WBT* D 3-24 and *PdT* C 815-836. Seven other cases within passages of less than 35 lines occur in the *Canterbury Tales*. The passage cited above, however, offers the only example which I have been able to find within a passage of less than 22 lines.

of merriment. *Tempest*, also, could mean either a physical storm of wind and rain, or, as Professor Curry<sup>7</sup> has pointed out, a noise, disturbance, or perturbation of almost any kind. Again, the possessive pronoun *hir* may be either the feminine singular, "her," or the plural "their."

On the other hand, there is less chance of misunderstanding the meaning of *weddyng* and *hoom-comynge*. These two events are first mentioned in an earlier couplet:

And weddede the queen Ypolita,  
And broghte hire hoom with hym in his contree (A 868 f.)

From that we see that Theseus married Hippolyta abroad. In the *Teseide*, in fact, they remained in Scythia for two years after their marriage. From the above couplet, furthermore, we see that they came to the shores of Greece together. Therefore, we are to interpret *hir hoom-comynge* as "their homecoming" and *hir weddyng* as, of course, "their wedding."

As for *tempest*, Professor Curry has observed that this word, in the sense of noise or disturbance, might refer to the tempest of applause which greeted the couple on their arrival at the shores of Greece. Obviously there was a noisy demonstration at this reception, and Chaucer's sources emphasize the fact that there was "*gran disio . . . mirabil festa . . . infiniti canti ed instrumenti*" and "*Letifici plausus missusque ad sidera vulgi Clamor*."

We may even go further and note that the *hoom-comynge* included not only the debarkation of the couple, but also their journey toward Athens, for Theseus asks the weeping ladies,

"What folk been ye, that at *myn hom-comynge*  
Perturben so my feste with criynge?" (A 905 f.)

We may thus consider "their homecoming" of line 884 as cover-

<sup>7</sup> W. C. Curry (*MLN.*, xxxvi, 272 ff.) noted this general meaning of the word *tempest*, citing copious examples of its use in this sense in ME and OF. Professor Robinson in his edition of Chaucer, however, dismisses the non-physical interpretation of the word as "unnatural" (p. 772). Yet the *NED*. lists as many examples of the word before 1500 in the non-physical senses as in the limited meteorological usage which Professor Robinson would here prescribe for it. To the examples cited by Professor Curry may be added the ME idiom *tempest thee not* ("do not get excited") which occurs twice in Chaucer, and the casual use of the word by Gower (*Conf. Amant.* i, 2142) to refer to the sound of the Trump of Death.

ing the events mentioned at this point in the narrative, when Theseus speaks of *his* homecoming. If so, the word *perturben* (MS Gg *disturblen*) affords a key to the further understanding of the word *tempest* in line 884, for the disturbance or tumult which broke out at this stage in their homecoming is vividly described. The lamentation made by the noble ladies was so loud—

That in this world nys creature lyvyng  
That herde swich another waymentynge (A 901 f.)

The word *tempest* thus refers to the entire demonstration which Chaucer had mentioned in his original text (ll. 872-4, 893-908), especially the disturbing noise made by the weeping women. Chaucer says that he will not tell us "fully the manere" of these things—that is, not as fully as they are given in the sources, but instead will proceed to the matter in hand.<sup>8</sup>

The word *feste*, as I have remarked, may refer to the festivities in general, and perhaps the presence of the word in lines 906 may throw light upon its use in line 883. Our general conclusion in regard to lines 883-4 is, then, that this fifth couplet, like the rest of the *occupatio* lines, repeats material from the earlier stratum of the Tale contained in lines 868-874 and 893-908, and may be explained on the basis of the present text of the Tale.

Professor Lowes maintains that the sources of the Tale offer no parallel for the allusion to a *tempest*.<sup>9</sup> Yet both the *Teseide* and the *Thebaid* make repeated mention of the noisy demonstrations on the arrival of Theseus and Hippolyta in Athens. The *Teseide* speaks of a "*turba di donne*" who

Si si levaron con alto furioso,  
Con alte grida, pianto e gran romore (II, stanza 25)

Boccaccio's use of the word *turba* (repeated in stanza 28) is in turn a distinct echo of Statius' *Thebaid*:

<sup>8</sup> A literal-minded person might say that Chaucer here contradicts himself: he puts the *tempest* among the things which the Knight says he must "forbear," and then proceeds to tell something about it. It is true that Chaucer, inserting these eighteen lines hastily, perhaps did not notice this apparent contradiction. But he is here employing a rhetorical figure, the *occupatio*, which was, for example, a favorite device with Cicero. Everyone will recall Cicero's constant protestations that he would not mention something, which he then proceeded to emphasize with grim insistence.

<sup>9</sup> J. L. Lowes, "The Tempest at hir Hoom-coming," *MLN.*, xix (1904), pp. 240-243.



Hunc vulgo monstrante locum, manus anxia Lernae  
Deveniunt: cedit miserorum turba priorum (xii, 512 f.)

The disturbance caused by their lamentations is emphasized in the *Teseide* and also in the *Thebaid*. In the latter it is compared with the noise of the Getic birds:

Unde hoc examen et una  
Tot miserae? . . .  
. . . Geticae non plura queruntur  
Hospitibus tectis trunco sermone volucres,  
Cum duplices thalamos et iniquum Terea clamant  
(xii, 472-480)

Chaucer's mention of a *tempest*, therefore, would seem to have been suggested by his sources.

Professor Lowes, on the other hand, proceeded to explain "the tempest at hir hoom-comynge" as a contemporary allusion on the basis of a reference in the chronicles to a storm which occurred on December 18, 1381, when Anne of Bohemia arrived in England to become the bride of Richard II, and he used this allusion at the same time to date the composition of the Tale. Numerous scholars have accepted this view since its appearance over thirty years ago, and Professor Robinson's endorsement in his edition of Chaucer has given it almost canonical status.

The opening of the *Knights Tale* is complete within itself, however, and does not need to be explained by any of the events in Chaucer's time.<sup>10</sup> Lowes's interpretation seems, moreover, singu-

<sup>10</sup> O. F. Emerson (*Stud. in Lang. and Lit. in Celebration . . . of J. M. Hart*, pp. 203 ff.) suggested still other allusions to the Richard-Anne match in the marriage of Palamon and Emelye at the end of the Tale. His discussion centered around lines 2970-7, which he felt were not sufficiently paralleled in the Italian source. As one reads the whole Chaucerian passage consecutively, however, one can account for these lines as a purely artistic device by which Chaucer sharpened the focus of the reader's attention progressively from a general idea of a conference in Athens to the specific idea of a marriage between Palamon and Emelye in order to secure for the Athenians "fully obeisance" of the countrymen of Palamon. If Palamon is Richard II, it seems unlikely that Chaucer would suggest that the English were to be subjugated as a result of this marriage. Professor Emerson anticipated this objection by saying that the French were the people whose "obeisance" was to be secured. But if such was Chaucer's intention, why did he not introduce the name of a third country at this point, and thus avoid the danger of seeming to identify Richard with the common enemy

larly inappropriate, for the Theseus-Hippolyta marriage did not in any respect parallel that of Richard and Anne. Theseus conquered Hippolyta, married her in Scythia, and then they proceeded to Greece in company. In the case of Richard and Anne, however, the negotiations for marriage proceeded from Bohemia rather than England. They were not married abroad, but Anne came alone to England, there to meet Richard. Even if we read "her homecoming" in line 884 the application of the phrase to Anne's arrival in England would be forced and unnatural; and if we adopt what seems the more probable reading, "their homecoming," the application to Anne and Richard would be quite impossible. The foregoing discussion has thus tended to establish the possibility suggested by Professor Tatlock that the whole second paragraph of the *Knight's Tale* was a later insertion.

It is interesting to note also in the Squire's Tale what appears to be a very similar use of the *occupatio* device. The Squire has been describing Cambyuskan's "vestiment" and his "feeste." Then in lines 63-75 he remarks that it would take all day to give the particulars of "al th' array" and the courses, and continues:

I wol nat taryen you, for it is pryme,  
And for it is no fruyt, but los of tyme;  
Unto my firste I wol have my recours (F 73-75)

Within these lines, however, there is an orderly repetition of material which stands before and after. Apparently, then, we have an inserted passage which stresses the exigencies of time, introduces an allusion to the pilgrimage in the mention of "pryme," and then turns back to the interrupted narrative in a phrase which recalls the line in the *Knight's Tale*: "ther I lefte, I wol ayeyn bigynne." If these lines are omitted, the narrative is in no way impaired; in fact, it gains in dramatic consistency and consecutiveness. And, most interesting of all, with the removal of this passage, the only allusion to the Canterbury pilgrimage in the entire Tale disappears. Though this mention of *pryme* is obviously a reference to the framework, it does not fit satisfactorily into the

against whom the marriage negotiations had been directed? Professor Manly has also pointed out that the line, "he is a kynges brother sone, pardee" (A 3084) would be strained and unnatural as a reference to Richard II, who was already king in his own right.

Canterbury scheme, inasmuch as nothing more is made of it in this Tale or the next. The opening of the *Squire's Tale* thus offers an interesting analogy to that of the *Knight's Tale*.<sup>11</sup>

WILLIS J. WAGER

New York University

### ANOTHER ANALOGUE TO *THE PRIORESSES TALE*

In the *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard, a work apparently composed in the seventh decade of the fourteenth century,<sup>1</sup> I have come upon the following hitherto unpublicized analogue to Chaucer's *Prioresses Tale*:

. . . Idem ostenditur per aliud miraculum, quod de ea legitur, quomodo videlicet clericum quandam a Iudaeis occisum, resuscitavit. Hic namque clericus in villa quadam moram traxisse dicitur, in qua multi habitabant Iudaei; in quorum infidelitatis testimonium cum per vicum, in quo morabantur, transiret, saepius aliquam cantilenam de beata Virgine cantare solebat. De quo Iudaei offensi tempus aptum expectantes, ipsum vno die occulte acceptum occiderunt, & in cloacam proiecerunt. Cito post, cum sacerdos ad ecclesiam veniret, & clericum non inuentum quaereret, audiuit ipsum de cloaca<sup>2</sup> cantilenam beatae Virginis alte clamantem; qui Christianos secum adducens, ipsum de loco illo eduxerunt, narrantem, quomodo per beatam Virginem ad vitam<sup>3</sup> resuscitatus fuerat.

<sup>11</sup> There are other noteworthy points of similarity between the *KnT* and *SqT*. Both lack adaptation throughout to the characters who are telling them. The Squire, for example, appears to be saying at line 281 that he is not as "fresh as May." The whole leisurely manner of the fragmentary Tale, moreover, seems ill suited to the Squire. If the *SqT* were completed according to the outline given at the end of the fragment as it now stands, it would be a tale of the proportions of the *KnT*. Both tales are romances, divided into *pars prima*, *pars secunda*, etc. The subject matter of the two is related through the intermediary of the *Anelida and Arcite*.

<sup>1</sup> See Owst, G. R., *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1933, pp. 224 and 596. Mr. Owst cites among other references Welter, J.-T., *L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge*, Paris, 1927, pp. 329-30, q. v. The text which follows is taken from the edition of the *S. P.* printed in Antwerp in 1614. I have collated with it the editions of Basel, 1484; Nuremberg, 1518; and Venice, 1586. The only variations of these from the Antwerp text are noted. The punctuation of the text is my own.

<sup>2</sup> Nuremberg and Venice, *cloaco*.

<sup>3</sup> Nuremberg and Basel, *vite* for *ad vitam*.

In his study of the development of the *Prioresses Tale*, published in 1910 by the Chaucer Society, Professor Carleton Brown made it very clear that the history of the legend is quite complicated and that his conclusions, based upon a relatively small number of texts, twenty-seven, were necessarily tentative.<sup>4</sup> This Bromyard version multiplies the known complications in the history of the story. Professor Brown found that his versions could be divided into three main classes;<sup>5</sup> but this one does not fit well into any of them. It begins with a boy whom we recognize as the familiar school-boy of groups A and C;<sup>6</sup> he cannot be the chorister of B group because a choir-boy could not have made regular trips through the Jewish quarter.<sup>7</sup> But the mother of the boy is not mentioned here; and her absence from the story is one of the distinguishing features of B versions.<sup>8</sup> It cannot be argued that she is left out because the author wished to be brief and chose not to mention who first became anxious about the boy; the Bromyard text specifically states that it was the priest. One of the details of this version is peculiar to the C group: never in stories outside that division is the body thrown into a jakes.<sup>9</sup> And finally, to make matters worse, the conclusion to our version is a typical A ending. In most of the C versions the boy is found dead and is not restored to life. And in the two (or three) in which he does live again his resurrection occurs after he has been carried to the church.<sup>10</sup> In other words, nowhere in group C do the searchers find him really alive. But in the A stories he has already been

<sup>4</sup> Brown, Carleton, *Study of the Miracle of Our Lady Told by Chaucer's Prioress*, London, 1910. Ch. Soc., 2 ser., no. 45. See pp. vi, vii, 99, and *passim*. Since it is obviously impossible to present here any of the details of Professor Brown's analysis, it is necessary to assume that the reader is somewhat familiar with his monograph. An earlier work on the same subject by Professor Brown is "Chaucer's Prioress' Tale and its Analogues," *PMLA.*, xxi, 486-518. This study is superseded by the Chaucer Soc. monograph.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 119-20.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-8.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

<sup>10</sup> See C II, p. 35, and C VIII, p. 44. C I, p. 34, does not state specifically whether the boy was finally resurrected or not. But here too he was not alive when the searchers found him: ". . . Inuenerunt puerum mortuum."

resuscitated when the searchers arrive.<sup>11</sup> The conclusion of B versions is of course completely different from that of this Bromyard text.<sup>12</sup> Thus, we have before us a definitely A conclusion.

There are, then, distinctive features of all three of Professor Brown's groups in this one story. The tentative nature of Professor Brown's conclusions ought, I think, to be emphasized. He relied principally upon collections of legends of the Virgin in securing his analogues. But why should not the story occur in any medieval anthology of religious tales? The number of such collections is, of course, enormous. In Appendix III of *L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge*,<sup>13</sup> Welter lists over seven hundred manuscripts containing more or less extensive groups of religious stories. Confronted by such an overwhelming mass of uninvestigated material, one cannot but doubt that Professor Brown's twenty-seven versions represent adequately the development of the story. It may be that they do; but here is indeed a twenty-eighth which does not fit into his groups.

The location of known versions suggests a further likely field for search for others. The seventh text of Professor Brown's B group is taken from the *Speculum Exemplorum*,<sup>14</sup> a late fifteenth century collection of stories which, though designed to be useful to all Christians, was compiled with preachers particularly in mind.<sup>15</sup> The first version of C group is found in a manuscript which also contains sermons,<sup>16</sup> and which, therefore, was very probably addressed to preachers. The appearance of the story in the *Summa Praedicatorum*, one of the most famous of the medieval books of sermon materials produced in England,<sup>17</sup> would appear to lend significance to the locations of the texts just mentioned. The

<sup>11</sup> See pp. 1 ff.

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 20 ff.

<sup>13</sup> See note 1.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>15</sup> I have not seen a copy of this work; but J.-T. Welter, *op. cit.*, p. 388, summarizing the author's prologue, says: "Il les [the exempla] a réunis en un seul livre . . . où il est donné à tout chrétien de voir comme dans un miroir très pur la beauté ou la laideur de ses actions. Puis il se met à donner des conseils pratiques aux prédicateurs qui se serviront de son recueil. . . ."

<sup>16</sup> Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

<sup>17</sup> See Owst, G. R., *Preaching in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1926, pp. 224 and 279.

story was very likely in fairly frequent use as a pulpit exemplum. A search of sermon manuscripts for further versions would probably be productive of results.

WOODBURN O. ROSS

*University of North Dakota*

### A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S PARDONER'S PROLOGUE

One of the subtlest devices used by Chaucer's pardoner to extort money from the ignorant upon whom he preyed was the form of blackmail which he proudly demonstrates to the Canterbury pilgrims in the following passage:

Goode men and wommen, o thyng warne I yow:  
 If any wight be in this chirche now  
 That hath doon synne horrible, that he  
 Dar nat, for shame, of it yshryven be,  
 Or any womman, be she yong or old,  
 That hath ymaad hir housbonde cokewold,  
 Swich folk shal have no power ne no grace  
 To offren to my relikes in this place.  
 And whoso fyndeth hym out of swich blame,  
 He wol come up and offre in Goddes name,  
 And I assoille him by the auctoritee  
 Which that by bulle ygraunted was to me.  
 By this gaude have I wonne, yeer by yeer,  
 An hundred mark sith I was pardoner.<sup>1</sup>

That Chaucer drew upon a contemporary source for this passage has been suggested by W. B. Sedgwick, who has called attention to a thirteenth-century German analogue in the *Pfaffe Ameis*.<sup>2</sup> In the latter the identical trick used by the pardoner is described, and the passage ends with a description of the women flocking forward to the speaker with their gifts lest they be suspected of infidelity.

A closer analogue, hitherto unnoted, appears as an exemplum in a fifteenth-century Latin collection of religious narrative, where the trick is definitely attributed to a pardoner of Ferrara:

Quidem querens quaestam Ferraria post predicationem suam dixit dominabus cum deberent offerre, dixit: Si est aliqua domina quae fecerit

<sup>1</sup> Robinson, *Chaucer's Complete Works*, p. 180, ll. 377-390.

<sup>2</sup> *MLR.*, xix (1924), 336-7.

fallum de marito, uel de persona sua, non ueniat ad offerendum, quoniam mansio, uel domus nostra, non uult talem pecuniam, uel oblationem, et tunc omnes inerunt ad offerendum, et quae non habebat pecuniam accipiebat mutuo ut non suspicaretur de fallo.<sup>3</sup>

Together the two analogues suggest very definitely that Chaucer has used a contemporary source for the passage, probably an exemplum very much like the one quoted. The objection that the exemplum is found in a fifteenth-century manuscript is not valid, for almost always individual exempla were older than the collections in which they appeared, and in this particular case the appearance of the story in the *Pfaffe Ameis* definitely establishes its antiquity. Chaucer's source may well have been an exemplum of the fourteenth century, for at that time opposition to pardoners was growing intense, and it was probably during that century that the story of the blackmail trick, told of a priest in the *Pfaffe Ameis*, was changed to make it another expression of distrust of the pardoners.

EDWARD H. WEATHERLY

*Northwestern University*

---

## A NOTE ON THE MILLER'S PROLOGUE

For I wol telle a legende and a lyf  
Bothe of a carpenter and of his wyf

CT. (1) 3141-3142

This note is to suggest an interpretation of line 3141 above which may add a bit to our conception of Chaucer's conscious artistry in the first dramatic clash of his *Human Comedy*. The host has just requested the monk to tell something to match the knight's "noble storie." The drunken miller, interrupting, takes up the challenge by asserting in "Pilates voys" that he will tell a "noble tale." In other words, he drunkenly boasts that he will meet the knight on his own ground. All this is immediately obvious. But after Bailey, unsuccessful in his efforts to sidetrack the miller, calls him a drunken fool and permits him to proceed, the latter, as indicated above, promises to tell a "legende and a lyf." He has already agreed to match the knyght. Now in his

<sup>3</sup> Harleian MS. 3938, ff. 124b-125.

reference to saints' legends he turns and challenges also the monk, whom he has pushed into the background and whose place he is taking. The quoted phrase suggests this. And the monk's words when he is again invited to entertain the company tend to confirm this suggestion:

And if you list to herkne hyderward  
I wol you seyn the lyf of Seint Edward,  
Or ellis, first, tragedies wol I telle.

CT. (VII) 1969-1971.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN

*University of North Carolina*

### PRECIOUS STONES IN *THE HOUSE OF FAME*

Few people seem to have noticed that according to the lapidaries the topaz is the stone of chastity, and that this quality agrees with the character of the gentle knight who, in Chaucer's own *Canterbury Tale*, is thus named.<sup>1</sup> Years ago Professor Sypherd drew attention to the fact that beryl as a stone that fosters love was especially appropriate for the construction of what was at least in literary tradition a court of love edifice, Chaucer's house of Fame. For this particular symbolism Mr. Sypherd quoted evidence from *L'Intelligenza*.<sup>2</sup> But if beryl carried this meaning in the fourteenth century, the idea is important for our understanding of Chaucer's poem, with reference, for example, to the poet's search for tidings of love.

For whi me thoughte, be seynt Gyle!  
Al was of ston of beryle,  
Bothe the castel and the tour,  
And eke the halle and every bour,  
Wythouten peces or joynynges.<sup>3</sup>

The point really needs further support, especially from the source

<sup>1</sup> The honor of the discovery goes to W. O. Ross, *MLN.*, XLV (1930), 172 ff. See also *English Mediaeval Lapidaries*, J. Evans and M. S. Serjeantson, *EETS.*, 190, London, 1933, pp. 19, 106, and 122. Cf. J. M. Manly, *Cant. Tales*, N. Y. [1928], p. 630, and the text B. 1935.

<sup>2</sup> W. O. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame*, Chaucer Soc., London, 1907, p. 133, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *House of Fame*, 1183-1187.



which, it is apparent, Chaucer himself and *L'Intelligenza* both used. A little later in the poem he refers specifically to the "Lapidaire"<sup>4</sup>—presumably that of Marbodius—and there we find in the Latin *De Beryllo*:

Hic est coniugii gestare refertur amorem,  
Et se portantem perhibetur magnificare.<sup>5</sup>

The form of the word *lapidaire*, however, suggests that Chaucer—(one may perhaps say), as usual—consulted a French version as well as the Latin, or even without the Latin. An Anglo-Norman rendering, for example, says of the beryl:

Ome e feme fait entramer  
E ki la porte enurer.<sup>6</sup>

In twelfth century prose we find it again thus: "Iceste portet amur entre hume et femme et fait honur a celui ki la ported."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Line 1352.

<sup>5</sup> Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, CLXXI, col. 1747. Marbode seems to have got the idea from Damigeron: "Gestat amorem coniugii et portantem . maiorem omnium facit" (from twelfth century MSS.), J. Evans, *Magical Jewels of the Mid. Ages and the Ren.*, etc., Oxford, 1922, p. 198 (App. A). Cf. p. 21, and see P. Meyer, *Romania*, xxxviii (1909), 494. Vincent of Beauvais quotes several authors to the same effect, *Speculum Maius*, viii, c. xlvii; and the material is found again in Bartholomew Anglicus, *De Propr. Rer.* (Nuremberg, 1492, Hain \*2510, Proctor 2073), xvi, cap. xxi, *de Berillo*. Cf. Trevisa's rendering, ed Wynken de Worde, 1496, xvi, cap. xx.

<sup>6</sup> P. Studer and J. Evans, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, Paris, 1924, p. 40, 313-314, probably from England in the first half of the twelfth century (cf. p. 24). Also in L. Pannier's *Les Lapidaires Français*, etc., Paris, 1882, p. 45. Cf. the adaptation, Studer and Evans, p. 84, 395-396.

<sup>7</sup> Studer and Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 99; also *Romania*, xxxviii, p. 273. Note also in the "second prose lapidary," Studer and Evans, p. 131: "Le beril nurist amur entre homme et femme," etc. (cf. Evans, *Magical Jewels*, p. 218); in the third, p. 143; an original touch appears in prose, p. 153: "Ki sur lui la porte, si se combat a sun enemi, il le veintera" (cf. Barthol. Angl., *De Propr. Rer.*, Trevisa's trans., xvi, c. xx: "the vertue of berell that is moost pale is beste ayenste peryll of enmyes & ayenst stryfe . . ."); also the Cambridge version, p. 167:

El est mult bone a oes a femme  
Ki voelt avoir par grant honur  
Tuz tens l'amur de sun seignur;  
E ki la porte netement  
En honur creist; . . .

Further examples may be found on pp. 214 and 291 ("Iceste pierre garde

This formula or something like it is often repeated. In a fifteenth-century Middle English lapidary of London, based on a French original, it appears once more: "The boke seith þat berill norissheth loue betwene man and woman . . . & who þat berith hit shall be muche worshipped."<sup>8</sup>

From these passages and the common tradition they represent it is clear that the beryl has a twofold appropriateness in Chaucer's poem. To this the poet adds another, namely that beryl shines like glass and makes everything "more than hit was."<sup>9</sup> In view of Chaucer's use of court of love material, it is interesting to note that the lapidaries often refer specifically to wedded love. As Trevisa renders Bartholomew Anglicus, the beryl "makyth a man grete of state: & loueth well loue of matrimony."<sup>10</sup>

Another stone used in the poem is the ruby. Fame sits:

in a see imperiall,  
That mad was of a rubeo all,  
Which that a carbuncle ys ycalled.<sup>11</sup>

The carbuncle itself in the lapidaries is distinguished for its power of illumination.<sup>12</sup> Perhaps it appeared in that way in accounts of the Otherworld realm similar to that of Fame which the poet directly or indirectly knew,<sup>13</sup> and so its use here was first suggested.

*l'amour des entreesposez*"); also *Romania*, xxxviii, 64 (see Studer and Evans, pp. 4 and 84, MS. E) and 502 (Studer and Evans, p. 214); *RF.*, xvi (1904), 394; Pannier, *op. cit.*, p. 92, and cf. *ZRPh.*, xxxii (1908), 692. Note also Pannier, p. 123, and cf. *ZRPh.*, xxxvii (1913), 95; also Pannier, pp. 257 f., 631 ff. ("Honorez est qui beryl porte"); Evans, *Magical Jewels*, p. 226 ("Et amorem coniugum reconciliat. Gestantes magnificat.")

<sup>8</sup> Evans and Serjeantson, *English Med. Lapidaries*, p. 28 (cf. p. 16). For others see pp. 48, 72, and 125.

<sup>9</sup> *House of Fame*, 1288-1291.

<sup>10</sup> *Lib.*, xvi, cap. xx.

<sup>11</sup> 1361-1363.

<sup>12</sup> So Marbodius, col. 1754 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, clxxi); Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norm. Lap.*, pp. 49, 519 ff.; 110; 153; 175; Evans, *Magical Jewels*, 227; etc.

<sup>13</sup> One may recall the palace in the *Pelerinage de Charlemagne* (with the two youths each holding an ivory horn) illuminated by a carbuncle on a pillar, ed. E. Koschwitz, *Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerus.*, etc., Leipzig, 1913, 423 and 442 ff. Cf. *Speculum*, vii (1932), pp. 500 ff., especially 508, 510, and 511; *Scandinavian Studies*, x (1929), pp. 190 ff.; *Speculum* ix (1934), pp. 200-201; *MP.*, xxv (1928), 340-1; Skeat, *Com-*

But the real point in the present context is the ruby, for which "carbuncle" is merely a definition. Of this variety, although Marbodius tells us nothing in his Latin, the French lapidaries offer an account with special importance for us here:

Rubi escharbuncle done amur de seignurage  
E maintient home en (grant) vasselage.  
(E) done amur de Deu e de gent,  
D'ami e d'amie ensement.<sup>14</sup>

In thirteenth-century prose the ruby "est de si haute seignurie, ke si homme ki la porte vent entre genz, tuz luy portent honur et grace et tuz s'esjoient de sa venue."<sup>15</sup> The same theme appears in the London Lapidary: "... the gentil rubie fyne & clene is lorde of stones. . . . He is of suche lordeshippe þat when he þat bereth hym cometh amonge men, all thei shul bere hym honeur & grace & all shul bere hym joye of his presence." He "wynneth to a man lordeshippe above othre stones."<sup>16</sup>

The symbolism therefore is strikingly appropriate in the *House of Fame*. But one may perhaps question whether Chaucer had it in mind; for he uses the ruby elsewhere in a different way, notably as an emblem of martyrdom in the *Prioress's Tale*.<sup>17</sup> In the *Legende of Good Women*, however, he seems to show a reminiscence of the lapidaries when he speaks of the ruby "that shynede by nyghte"<sup>18</sup>—more significant, I think, as evidence than a similar

plete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, III (Oxford, 1900), p. 275, n. on 1363; also the *Romaunt of the Rose*, 1120-1128, and *Cant. Tales*, B. 2061.

<sup>14</sup> Studer and Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 89, 547-550 (from England "probably not before the middle of the thirteenth century," p. 71); also *Romania*, XXXVIII, 67.

<sup>15</sup> Studer and Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 126. See pp. 116 f. for relations with the *Lapidaire Chrétien* and cf. Pannier, *Les Lapid. Fr.*, pp. 246, 283 ff. Also see *RF*, XVI (1904), p. 391; in Latin, Evans, *Magical Jewels*, 215 ("dat graciā et fauorem et gaudium").

<sup>16</sup> Evans and Serjeantson, *Eng. Med. Lapid.*, p. 21. Other instances are on pp. 41, 110, and 123 f.

<sup>17</sup> B. 1800. There are many uses of the ruby in medieval literature. Cf. "heo is rubie of ryhtfulnesse," *Eng. Lyrics of the XIII Cent.*, Oxford, 1932, p. 149, 46; four jewels under the rain-making stone in Chrétien's *Yvain*, 426 ff.; cf. also Boccaccio, *Decam.*, II, v; *Piers Plowman*, B ii, 12 (ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1886, I, p. 40); Dante's *Paradiso*, xix, 4; etc.

<sup>18</sup> 1119. The scene is Libya, where, the lapidaries tell us, rubies may be found. For the phrase cf. Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norm. Lap.*, p. 139: "et vous di ke ki metroit le rubin fin en une sale par nuit sans

allusion to the carbuncle would have been. In any case one cannot pass over the specific reference in the *House of Fame* to the "Lapidaire," the sort of treatise which, I suspect, Chaucer was likely to examine. But another interesting question presents itself, in view of the fact that the ruby in works of this kind does not seem commonly to be associated with love. Into the story of Troilus and Criseide the poet deliberately introduces the figure of the ruby and the ring. "And, be ye wis as ye be fair to see," says Pandarus, pleading with Criseyde, "Wel in the ryng than is the ruby set."<sup>19</sup> "O ryng, fro which the ruby is out falle," exclaims Troilus in his beautiful ode to the empty house after Criseyde's departure. To crown these examples, we have finally the *broche*, "gold and azure," "In which a ruby set was lik an herte," which Criseyde gave to him in the days of their happiness. Curiously enough the ring and the ruby appear again, this time as the gift of Troilus, in Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*.<sup>20</sup> Curiously again this seems to replace the other "broche" which Troilus, according to Chaucer,<sup>21</sup> gave to Criseyde.

In these passages the ruby seems to have more or less reference to the love-affair. A heart-shaped jewel of red was a natural symbol of passion, and, by transference, of the lady herself perhaps. Stones of this kind Chaucer had almost certainly seen in actual life. One is of particular interest to us as an example, "le bonne rubie" which John of Gaunt left in his will to his wife Katharine. The gem may have a literary history—that is, if we may be permitted to indulge in that gossip which Fama is prone to spread; for it seems to turn up on the neck of Joan Beaufort (granddaughter of John of Gaunt and Katharine) in her lover's poem, the *Kingis Quair*:

About hir neck, quhite as the fyre amaille,  
A gudely cheyne of smale orfeverye,

---

lumiere, qu'i geteroit ausi grant resplendeur comme une candoille." Also see Simund de Freine, *Oeuvres*, ed. J. E. Matzke, *SATF.*, Paris, 1909, p. 18, 467-468. Note Marbodius with reference to the carbuncle (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, CLXXI, col. 1754): "Huius nec tenebrae possunt exstinguere lucem"; so too Evans, *Magical Jewels*, p. 227.

<sup>19</sup> ii, 584-585; cf. iii, 890-891. The next two quotations respectively come from v, 549 and iii, 1370-1371.

<sup>20</sup> Lines 582 ff.

<sup>21</sup> v, 1660-1661; cf. *Philos.*, viii, 9-10.

Quhareby there hang a ruby, without faille,  
 Lyke to ane herte schapin verily,  
 That, as a sperk of lowe, so wantonly  
 Semyt birnyng upon hir quhyte throte.<sup>22</sup>

Did James I. draw from the treasury of the *Troilus* or from experience? On the other hand, another ruby, this one in a ring, appears with what I take to be a similar meaning in Guillaume de Machaut's *Fonteinne Amoureuse*, where the Prince's lady bestows it on her lover, or so he dreams, and he finds it on his finger when he awakens.<sup>23</sup> One may also note, perhaps, in Chaucer's line "Wel in the ryng than is the ruby set" a chance echo of a phrase very common in the lapidaries regarding this stone: "Ele deit estre mise en bon or."<sup>24</sup> Possibly both expressions reflect some current proverb. In any case, the interpretation of the ruby in the *Troilus* does not make the use of the stone less appropriate in the *House of Fame* as a symbol sometimes of love and generally of honor and renown.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

---

<sup>22</sup> 330-335. The reference in John of Gaunt's will may be found in S. Armitage-Smith's *John of Gaunt*, etc., N. Y. and London, 1905, p. 426. Elizabeth of Hainaut left a gold ring with a ruby and an emerald to a Prioress, according to Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer*, N. Y. [1926], p. 208. Several balas rubies were bought by John of Gaunt (*Register*, ed. Armitage-Smith, Camden Soc., London, 1911, 3d. s. 21, II, pp. 193, 194) and the Earl of Derby (*Expeditions to Prussia*, etc., ed. L. T. Smith, Camden Soc., London, 1894, n. s. 52, p. 287, 25 ff., with comment p. lxxi). For modern interpretations of the symbolism of the ruby see I. Kozminsky, *The Magic and Science of Jewels and Stones*, N. Y., 1922, p. 348, and G. H. Bratley, *The Power of Gems and Charms*, London, 1907, p. 124.

<sup>23</sup> *Oeuvres*, ed. E. Hoepffner, III (Paris, 1921, SATF.), pp. 232 ff., 2504, 2711 and 2843.

<sup>24</sup> Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norm. Lap.*, p. 127. Cf. also p. 139, and even of the balas ruby, p. 140: "et doit estre assis en or ausi come li rubis." The same thing is said of some other stones, notably the topaz. See also RF., XVI, 391; Evans, *Eng. Med. Lapid.*, p. 124, etc., and for another possible echo Dante, *Paradiso*, XXX, 66.

# A POSSIBLE RELATION BETWEEN CHAUCER'S LONG LEASE AND THE DATE OF HIS BIRTH

One of the unexplained facts in Chaucer's life is his leasing a house for fifty-three years when he himself was in his fifties. The terms of the lease were such as to render the more inexplicable the extraordinary length of this contract. The house could not be sub-let, and the lease was to expire immediately upon his death.<sup>1</sup> Thus if he had children they would be unable to continue in possession. Whether Chaucer realized it or not, he was within eight months of his death when in December, 1399, he rented the tene-ment in the garden of St. Mary's Chapel in Westminster Abbey. Certainly he did not think he would live to be more than a hundred years old. And why choose a term of precisely fifty-three years? Why not fifty, the round number?

Possibly the most sensible explanation has been that Chaucer took over an unexpired lease, of a long tenure.<sup>2</sup> However, the history of the dwelling just before and just after Chaucer's occupancy is against this theory. John Edryk, usher of the exchequer, is in possession from 1397 to 1399. Chaucer has it from December, 1399, until, presumably, his death on October 25, 1400. At Michaelmas, 1400, a Master Paul (perhaps the king's physician, a Florentine, Master Paul de Monte) has the lease. In 1403 William Horscroft, a London skinner, is paying rent for the second year of a *seven year* lease.<sup>3</sup> From 1411 to 1434 Thomas Chaucer appears to be the occupant, evidently under the terms of a new lease.<sup>4</sup> These leases of but a few years do not indicate inheritance of a long contract. If John Edryk leased the dwelling for fifty-three years and occupied it for but two, and Chaucer took over the remaining fifty-three years, why should not the same long lease pass to those who succeeded Chaucer? Instead, it expired at his death, just as it passed rather quickly from his immediate successors. The differing sums paid also suggest a policy of new

<sup>1</sup> *Life-Records of Chaucer*, Pt. iv, ed. R. E. G. Kirk, London, 1900, Record 280, pp. 329-330.

<sup>2</sup> Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, ed. J. M. Manly, 1928, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> As discovered by Dr. Edward Scott, of the British Museum, while calendaring the Muniments of Westminster Abbey. Kirk, R. E. G., in *Life-Records*, Pt. iv, p. 330, Note I.

leases. Where Chaucer paid 53s. 4d., Master Paul paid 60s., Horscroft 41s., and Thomas Chaucer apparently 66s. 8p. (26s. 8d.?).<sup>5</sup> The changing amount of rental, the leases for seven years and other periods of time, the expiration of the lease at Chaucer's death, are all opposed to the hypothesis that Chaucer took over the remaining years of a long lease.

Another point to be taken into consideration is the coincidence of Chaucer's leasing a house for fifty-three years at a rental of some fifty-three shillings. The fifty-three shillings, since it is near the rent paid by other leasees, is reasonable; the fifty-three year period is not.

Sometimes one line of thought may lean upon another unable to stand alone, as in architecture two beams lend support to each other. Consideration of the coincidences relating to the lease suggests a possible connection with a point of much greater interest, the date of Chaucer's birth.

The approximate date of Chaucer's birth, long accepted as 1340, is now considered as nearer 1345.<sup>6</sup> The chief document bearing on the matter is the testimony given at the Scrope-Grosvenor trial in 1386.<sup>7</sup> This trial in the Court of Chivalry, as it is preserved in the Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, took place before Sir John de Derwentwater in the Refectory of Westminster Abbey. The description of Chaucer preceding his testimony gives him as "Gefray Chaucere, Esquier, del age de XL ans et plus, armez par XXVII ans." If Chaucer were exactly forty years old at the time of this trial in 1386, the date of his birth would be indicated as 1346. The catch comes in the "et plus." Could it be interpreted as the child's "going on" another year, it might mean any period under twelve months. Chaucer, then, would have been born at some date between October, 1345, and October, 1346. However, the careful study made by Professor Samuel Moore of testimony in many cases and especially of the more than two hundred depositions in this case indicates a tendency to give the age in round numbers, counting only by fives and tens; and "et plus," intended originally perhaps to denote a period of months between one birth-

<sup>5</sup> Kirk, *loc. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> Manly, John M., *Some New Light on Chaucer*, New York, 1926, p. 66; *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, edited by F. M. Robinson, 1933, p. xv.

<sup>7</sup> *Life-Records*, Record 193, pp. 264-265.

day and the next, had by Chaucer's time come to be only a formula, almost without meaning. Nevertheless, as Professor Manly has pointed out, we may not assume inaccuracy on the part of Chaucer, who was well-educated, possibly to the precision demanded in a law school,<sup>8</sup> versed in science and mathematics, and apparently keen in the conduct of business and diplomatic affairs. Chaucer himself proves his accuracy<sup>9</sup> in this very deposition by his statement that he had been under arms twenty-seven years,<sup>10</sup> the exact period from 1359 to 1386.

Also, the events of Chaucer's life, according to recent opinion, agree rather with a date of birth in the neighborhood of 1345. If born in 1340, Chaucer would have been page to Princess Elizabeth, wife of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, when seventeen, too old probably for such a position. The low amount allowed for clothes in 1357 also suggests the small boy instead of one nearly grown. As to Chaucer the writer, his first extant work, *The Book of the Duchess*, produced about 1369, seems immature for a man of twenty-nine.<sup>11</sup>

The objections to even as late a date as 1346 do not seem insurmountable. That Chaucer would have been only thirteen when with the army in France is not out of reason; in modern times boys but little older have enlisted. Also, it is not known in what capacity Chaucer served. More difficult to accept is the fact that Chaucer at fourteen should carry a letter from Prince Lionel in France to Edward III in England; but Lionel presumably was able to judge as to the reliability of the youth who had been a member of his family for several years. Another argument advanced in favor of the earlier date is Chaucer's frequent reference to his advancing age; various commentators in answer to this objection have cited similar utterances by poets in middle age or early manhood.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Manly, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 7-30.

<sup>10</sup> Chaucer was with the army in France in 1359. *Life-Records*, Pt. iv, Record 34, p. 153.

<sup>11</sup> Manly, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

<sup>12</sup> Notably perhaps Eustache Deschamps, a French contemporary of Chaucer's, who before he was forty-five complained as did Chaucer of his years. Manly, *New Light on Chaucer*, pp. 65-66.



It is rather generally conceded then to-day that the facts of Chaucer's life point to a date of birth nearer 1345 than 1340.<sup>13</sup> Yet even while admitting the probability of Chaucer's accuracy, Chaucerian scholars, following a middle course, incline to put the date of birth around 1343 or 1344.<sup>14</sup>

Any connection between the question of Chaucer's birth and his strange action in leasing a house for an unwarrantably long period must make large demands upon the imagination. Let us imagine Chaucer, an old man by the standards of the Middle Ages, renting himself a house. Perhaps his health is not good; perhaps he wishes to settle down for a little uninterrupted writing, after the busy years during which he has been successively an official in Kent, a member of Parliament, Clerk of the Works—a very strenuous job—and subforester of North Petherton Forest. As a younger man he has perhaps preferred to live close to the heart of London. When he selects his first house, after his residence at court, it is over one of the city gates, where from his windows he can look down upon all the varied life streaming into and out of London. Now, eight months before his death, his choice is different. A quiet house this must be; so he seeks him out a dwelling in the garden of St. Mary's Chapel in Westminster Abbey, not far from the abbey mill stream but separated from it by the great gate.<sup>15</sup> He makes the necessary business arrangements with Brother Robert Hermodsworth, Monk of the Abbey and Warden of the Chapel.<sup>16</sup> For how long a period shall he lease the property? Twenty years? Twenty-five? He wishes to spend his last days in this house; what limit shall be set to his life? He cannot quite face that question. Meanwhile he repeats to himself the terms of the rent—a little over fifty-three shillings. Why, he tells the warden, he is but a bit over fifty-three himself. And suddenly Chaucer smiles whimsically. Why not add to the coincidence and save himself the decision? He will lease the house for fifty-three years.

An imaginary scene certainly. And yet there remains the coincidence of figures for the rental and for the years of the lease.

<sup>13</sup> Manly, *New Light on Chaucer*, p. 66.

<sup>14</sup> Manly, *loc. cit.*; Robinson, *loc. cit.*

<sup>15</sup> As indicated by leases to other tenants. Manly, *Canterbury Tales*, p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> Kirk, in Foreword to *Life-Records*, p. 1.

Chaucer seems to have been the kind of man who, given two identical figures, might thus match them with a third, especially if at the same time he could avoid facing a disagreeable fact.

While we admit that this explanation is far-fetched and leans too heavily upon coincidence, it does fit with the known facts of Chaucer's life, where otherwise the length of lease is inexplicable and the date of birth does not tally with the evidence at the trial. If Chaucer was more than fifty-three in December of 1399, he was born in 1346 or, less probably, late in 1345. In October of 1386, then, he could well be the age stated in the only documentary evidence we have—forty and more.

HAZEL ALLISON STEVENSON

*Florida State College for Women*

---

#### A MEDIAEVAL FRENCH ANALOGUE TO THE DUNMOW FLITCH

Few British popular customs have had such an enduring life as that manifested by the Dunmow Flitch. Barring occasional interruptions, this quaint ceremony has remained in force ever since its institution, which tradition assigns to the twelfth or thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> Since 1921 it has been celebrated annually and

<sup>1</sup> According to James Caulfield, *Portraits, Memoirs, and Characters of Remarkable Persons* (London, 1820), iv, 151, the practice was begun "in or about the year 1111 by Robert, son of Richard Fitz-Gilbert, Earl of Clare," but William Hone in *The Everyday Book* (London), II (1827), 803, makes Robert Fitzwalter (reign of Henry III) the original donor. For the earliest documentary evidence that the flitch was offered, two entries in the Chartulary of Dunmow Priory, which record presentations in 1445 and 1510, see J. W. R. Scott, "The Peer Who Won the Dunmow Flitch," *The Essex Review*, XXI (1912), 195 f. C. D. H. Grimes in "The Dunmow Chair," *The Antiquary*, I (1905), 309, conjectures that the custom was attached to the tenure of the manor since it was continued after the priory had been dissolved. That the flitch ceased to be offered in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries seems attested by a remark made in *The Weekly Journal* for June 15, 1717, where it is said: "It [*i. e.*, the bacon] has been lately demanded by a Lady of good Fortune and her Husband, who live in Hatton-Garden, which the like has not been known in the Memory of Man, nay, nor Woman; the Gammon was accordingly paid; but 'tis thought the Town will never be at the Charge of another." For these references I am indebted to Professor G. L. Kittredge.

has fathered similar trials, before and after that date, in various parts of England.<sup>2</sup> Allusions to it and to its offspring occur with some frequency in English literature, the best-known instance probably being two lines spoken by the Wife of Bath in her prologue:

The bacon was not fet for hem, I trowe,  
That some men han in Essex at Dunmowe.<sup>3</sup>

It would be interesting to learn what countries other than England observed the practice of awarding a gammon of bacon to that married couple who could truthfully swear they had never rued

<sup>2</sup> Notices of the trial are lacking in the index to the *London Times* for the years 1915-1919, but an announcement made on May 4, 1920, that the Dunmow pageant would not be held suggests that the competition had taken place the previous year. References in the *Times* to celebrations since 1920 are, by page and column, as follows: June 13, 1921, 7b; June 6, 1922, 6 (photograph), 12e, 16f; May 22, 1923, 9b; June 10, 1924, 9f; June 2, 1925, 14c, 19a (trial broadcasted); June 21, 1926, 16b; September 6, 1927, 15f; June 7, 1927, 9c; May 29, 1928, 9d; May 21, 1929, 10e; August 6, 1930, 8a; August 4, 1931, 12d; August 2, 1932, 13g; August 8, 1933, 7b; May 22, 1934, 7c. An account of the Whichenovre (Staffordshire) celebration, which dates from the fourteenth century, is given in *The Spectator*, Numbers 607 and 608 (October 15 and 18, 1714). Professor Kittredge has called my attention to a trial at Harrogate in June, 1764, described by J. E. Poppelton in "The Flitch of Bacon Oath," *Old Yorkshire*, I (1881), 128-9. For a trial at Stonehenge see the *London Times*, June 21, 1926, 16d; for one at Hanworth (Middlesex), August 6, 1929, 8d; for one broadcasted from Calne (Wiltshire), May 25, 1927, 27 f. An unsigned article appearing in the *Times* for September 6, 1927, 15f, tells how the custom is now celebrated. For a notice that Margate will assume responsibility for next year's Dunmow trial see the *Times*, April 27, 1934, 16e, and for mention of a Dunmow Flitch Bacon Company the issue of January 19, 1920, 9f.

<sup>3</sup> F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 93, lines 217-218. W. W. Skeat, ed., *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, v, (1900), 296, notes a reference to the Dunmow ceremony in *Piers Plowman*. Professor Kittredge has given me other references: (1) in Laud MS. 416 (c1460), printed by Thomas Wright and J. O. Halliwell in *Reliquiae Antiquae* (London, 1865), II, 29; (2) in "An Excellent New Medly," reprinted by William Chappell in *The Rowburghe Ballads*, I (1871), 60; (3) in *Tom Tyler and his Wife*, reprinted by F. E. Schelling in *PMLA*, xv (1900), 264, 284; (4) a musical comedy, *The Flitch of Bacon*, by the Reverend Bate Dudley, performed August 19, 1778, at Drury Lane and mentioned by W. C. Oulton in *The History of the Theatres of London* (London, 1796), I, 74; (5) a skit, "The Humours of Dunmow," appearing

their bargain. That it once obtained in Brittany was pointed out long ago by Tyrwhitt.<sup>4</sup> Noël du Fail, the Breton writer from whose *Contes d'Eutrapel* his information was quoted, remarked in 1585 that the Breton trial had existed more than five hundred years earlier.

J'ay dit an et jour pour la perfection et comble de la revolution et nombre annal, où nos praticiens jurisconsultes ont tant gambadé et fait des leurs. Car à l'Abbaie Saint Melaine, près Rennes, y a, plus de six cents ans sont, un costé de lard encore tout frais et non corrompu, et neantmoins voué et ordonné aux premiers qui par an et jour ensemble mariez ont vescu sans debat, grondement, et sans s'en repentir.<sup>5</sup>

Fresh proof that a bacon-competition existed in mediaeval France has come to light in an exemplum contained in Jacques de Vitry's *Sermones Feriales et Communes*. This dates, according to Greven,<sup>6</sup> from the period of de Vitry's cardinalate (1229-1240) and reads as follows:

Aliquando transiui per quandam villam in Francia, vbi suspenderant pernam seu bachonem in platea hac condicione, vt qui vellet iuramento firmare quod vno integro anno post contractum matrimonium permansisset cum vxore, ita quod de matrimonio non penituisset, bachonem haberet. Et cum per decem annos ibi pependisset, non est vnus solus inuentus qui bachonem lucraretur, omnibus infra annum de matrimonio contracto penitentibus.—Ecce quam pauci hodie vxoribus suis fide et dileccione sicut instituit Dominus noster Jhesus Christus qui est benedictus in secula seculorum. Amen.<sup>7</sup>

If the circumstances and conditions of the Dunmow trial are compared with those of St. Melaine, it will be seen that they agree in two respects: in both places the prize was granted by a

in *The Universal Songster* (London, 1834), I, 48. Dr. B. J. Whiting has pointed out to me two songs, "Mr. Clark and his Bacon," by George Colman, and "The Flitch of Bacon," both in *The Universal Songster*, I, 198, 64.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Tyrwhitt, ed., *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer* (London, 1830), IV, 223. The note does not occur in the first edition (1775-1778). Tyrwhitt mistakenly printed "Eutrape" for "Eutrapel," an error repeated by Skeat, *op. cit.*, v, 296.

<sup>5</sup> C. Hippeau, ed., *Contes et Discours d'Eutrapel* (Paris, 1875), II, 140-141.

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Greven, ed., *Die Exempla aus den Sermones Feriales et Communes des Jakob von Vitry* (Heidelberg, 1914), p. vii.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41. The exemplum was also printed by Goswin Frenken in *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry* (Munich, 1914), p. 128.

religious establishment, and in both the form of the oath required of the claimants employed the conventional phrase, "a year and a day."<sup>8</sup> In de Vitry's account, on the other hand, though the time stipulated is an entire year, there is no evidence that the trial took place under religious auspices.

In any case, the combined testimony of du Fail and de Vitry suggests that fitch-competitions occurred in France at a time not very distant from that in which the Dunmow ceremony began. Whether the French custom was older than the English or the converse it would be idle to speculate, but some importance attaches to recognizing that in both countries the practice was current long before Chaucer gave it literary immortality.

CHESTER L. SHAVER

Oberlin College

---

#### A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUBSTITUTION IN THE ROMAN DE MANDEVIE

The satirical *Roman de Mandevie* (1340) by Jean Du Pin, who later became abbot of Cluny, is composed of eight books, seven in prose, the eighth in rimed "sixains." This last book is a virulent review of the various classes of society from the Pope to the Peasants. The *Mandevie*, which exists in fifteen MSS. in various European libraries, had at least two printed editions, one at Chambéry, chez Antoine Neyret, in 1485, and one at Paris, chez Michel Le Noir, between 1500-1520.<sup>1</sup> The Chambéry edition agrees, except for scribal variants, with all the manuscripts. The Paris edition, made a score of years later, shows only scribal variants<sup>2</sup> except in one instance — the chapter on the Pope. There, Le Noir, or whoever prepared the edition for him, deliberately took

<sup>8</sup> The original terms of the Dunmow oath may be those preserved in a distich quoted by Hone, *op. cit.*, II, 807:

He that repents not of his marriage in a year and a day either sleeping  
or waking  
May lawfully go to Dunmow and fetch a gammon of bacon.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Louis Karl, *Un moraliste bourbonnais du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle et son œuvre*, Paris, Champion, 1912, and "Le roman de Mandevie et les mélancholies de Jean Dupin," *Revue des Langues romanes*, LXIII (1926), 297-302.

<sup>2</sup> Karl says of the Paris edition only that "il diffère sensiblement des manuscrits."

out the *entire* chapter as Du Pin had written it, and composed one more in tune with the times, which he substituted for the original.

The spirit of the two periods is clearly shown in these two versions. The abuses are not the same in 1500 as they were in 1340, and Du Pin merely enumerates them and remarks that the duties of the Pope are thus and so. He ventures no word of warning to the wayward Pontiff. At the same time it is noticeable that he uses no other phrases to indicate the superhuman dignity of the Pope than:

Le pappe, qu'est la fleur royault  
De quoy noz ames sont lavées.

But *Le Noir* is distinctly of the early sixteenth century in his substituted version. For him the Pope

. . . pecher ne pourroit  
Comme saint père, ce seroit  
Allegué imperfection,

and

Il est Dieu souverain en terre,

an idea that would never have occurred to Jean Du Pin, churchman though he was. Like Du Pin, *Le Noir* enumerates the present vices and duties of the Pope, but he omits any reference to Avignon, where Du Pin of course locates the papal court, and he does not, as did Du Pin, reproach the Pope with nepotism (giving all the great offices to his "lignage"), with spending all his time in fortifying and beautifying his castle and palaces, with living in constant dread of being poisoned, etc.

*Le Noir* places the papal seat at "Romme," but while both he and Du Pin dwell upon "Symonie" at the court, *Le Noir* is especially aroused by the prevalent contemporary crime of "pardon" selling; and while both he and Du Pin mentioned the duties of the Pope, Du Pin contents himself with saying that the Pontiff should be "high-minded, humble, and benign," whereas *Le Noir* adds that the Pope *errs* if he does not pray to God tirelessly and surpass all other priests in sanctity. And what is especially new, *Le Noir* dares to tell the awful fate that will overtake the "Saint père" if he does not fulfill his official duties:

S'il mainne bien et droittement  
Les crestiens et justement

Paradis aura en lieu hault,  
 Mais se il se fait aultrement,  
 Pugny sera bien aigrement  
 En enfer qui est ung lieu chault.

In each edition the chapter on the Pope comprises about 120 lines. In his entire substitution, Le Noir uses but one line from the original, "Le prince des tenebres veille."

It was not an uncommon occurrence in the 15th and 16th centuries for an author to insert selections from the works of other writers, contemporary or earlier, into his own works and pass them off as his own; also it is common enough to find the editors of various books, after the authors' decease, swelling the quality and quantity of their own volumes by inserting selections from other writers—and saying nothing about it; and cases can even be found where an editor has changed somewhat the text of a book he was printing. But this Paris edition<sup>3</sup> of the *Mandevie* is the first instance I have seen of a deliberate substitution being made for a whole chapter in the middle of a connected work, leaving only one line of the original.

Of course it is not difficult to find plausible reasons for this substitution. Le Noir's edition appeared not only about the time—probably a few years earlier—that Luther brought to a head the discontent long fermenting within the Church, but it was also the time when Louis XII was having trouble with the warlike Jules II. Quite a number of French poems and other pieces that chide the Pope in more or less open terms were written in this period,<sup>4</sup> inspired either by a sense of patriotism or a feeling that the Church needed reform. This does not mean that the authors were not good Catholics. But the remarks made by Le Noir about His Holiness, as well as those in the *Blason de la guerre du pape* and other contemporary broadsides, show the way the wind was blow-

<sup>3</sup> Existing copies of both editions of the *Mandevie* are exceedingly rare. Prof. Karl lists two or three known copies of each edition in his booklet and article I have referred to. I know of two other copies: of the Chambéry edition at the Pierpont Morgan library in New York, and of the Paris edition in the Library of Congress, in the Vollbehr collection. All the copies of the Paris edition are alike.

<sup>4</sup> For a list of these pieces, cf. Ch. Oulmont, *Pierre Gringore*, pp. 214-228, and *Romania*, VII, 263.

ing, and this substitution by Le Noir in the second edition of the *Roman de Mandevie* is decidedly in the spirit of the times.

We may assume with certainty that the substituted chapter was not taken from any other poem of the period. Le Noir doubtless composed those lines himself, acting with understandable caution when he preferred to put his composition in the middle of another man's book rather than to print it separately, for, if he had been caught after saying that "Hell, which is a hot place, awaits the Pope if he does not conduct himself in seemly fashion," he himself might have come to a much hotter end without having so far to journey.

R. E. PIKE

Minneapolis, Minn.

---

#### VICTORIAN AND ARRIDE

The *NED.* states that the term *Victorian* is of American origin and credits E. C. Stedman with its first use in 1875. But it must have been current in England as early as March 1862, for it appears in the journal of Sir William Hardman (*A Mid-Victorian Pepys*, annotated and edited by S. M. Ellis, London, 1923) under that date (*ibid.*, p. 103), "You Victorians seem to have settled down. . . ."

*Webster's*, the *Century*, the *Standard*, and the *New English* dictionaries treat *arride* as obsolete, or at least as archaic, and the *NED.* dates its last use as that by Lamb in 1823. But Hardman uses both *arride* and *arrided* in his journal of March 1862 (*ibid.*, p. 101), "I . . . was greatly arrided . . . by what I saw"; and (*ibid.*, p. 105), "*The Sackfull of Newes* consists of . . . merry jests such as used to arride our ancestors." That Hardman was not out of touch with the linguistic usage of his time is evident from the fact that he was editor of *The Morning Post* for eighteen years. It is probable, therefore, that the words he uses were familiar to his contemporaries.

J. M. PURCELL

Marquette University

---



REVIEWS

---

*The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.* Edited by F. N. ROBINSON. The Cambridge Poets. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1933. Pp. xl + 1133.

Scholars in this country, who often, quite properly, are troubled by the state of higher studies in our universities and who in their own persons feel the intellectual life submerged in routine teaching, in committees, and in the nineteenth hole of one kind or another, have long taken comfort in the achievements of American Chaucerians; for here more conspicuously than in any other field of English studies we have more than held our own. Some years ago I reviewed in these columns Professor Manly's remarkable edition of a selection from the *Canterbury Tales*, and if that work bore all too plainly the marks of a divided purpose, it was still a great achievement which has left, and will continue to leave, its mark. Mr. Manly, for one thing, raised anew the problem of a satisfactory text; he tackled the difficult, perhaps insoluble, puzzle of Chaucer's manuscript and what happened to it at the hands of the first editors—for obviously some of those first scribes to whom the extant MSS. are ultimately due were editors—and he supplied a mass of new illustrative material which if it did not alter profoundly our notion of Geoffrey Chaucer and his world, gave to it a luminous reality which brought it closer to our business and bosoms. The long, laborious studies out of which that splendid fragment grew are still going forward, and we all share Professor Robinson's hope that we shall have before many years that definitive edition of the *Canterbury Tales* which Mr. Manly and Miss Rickert have set out to give us.

But when it does appear it will be a work for specialists. We shall go to it for solutions to our problems and for answers to questions of every sort. We shall hardly put it into the hands of students. And in any case it will be an edition of the *Canterbury Tales*, not of the whole canon.

Professor Robinson has undertaken a very different task: to prepare for the student, teacher, and amateur of Chaucer a dependable edition, fully abreast of modern scholarship, of the poet's complete works. And this he has done with rare distinction. He does not pretend to give in any case a definitive text, but he does give one every word of which represents the mature decision of a competent scholar; and his introductions, explanatory notes, and glossary are models of what such things ought to be. The textual notes are a good deal less satisfactory—I am thinking here once more of the

*Canterbury Tales*, — but perhaps that was inevitable unless Professor Robinson were prepared to print the whole *corpus* of variant readings — which, he is quite right in thinking, hardly belongs in a library edition. Still I cannot refrain from regretting that he does not *always*, and not merely frequently, record his departures from the Ellesmere MS. *Ellesmere* is so important, and in any case so interesting, that even the non-expert likes to know when the editor rejects its readings and what the rejected reading is. And to have supplied this information would not appreciably have swelled the volume of his apparatus.

The lack of a fuller critical apparatus here is the more to be regretted since Mr. Robinson's text throughout is one of the best things in his edition. We cannot now know, even in the case of works like the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Troilus* for which we have excellent MS. authorities, *literatim* or even *verbatim* what Chaucer wrote. And since these MSS., even the best of them, are faulty, an editor has no choice but to edit. He may do so with the easy eclecticism of Skeat or the rather excessive conservatism of Mr. Manly, but he must make decisions, and since he must, it is altogether better that he should do so in accordance with well-defined principles. Mr. Robinson makes no bones about it. He does not belong, as he confesses, "to the severest critical school." He sees no point in perpetuating the ignorance, the vagaries, and the carelessness of fifteenth-century copyists. He assumes, as Koch does, that Chaucer wrote good verse and good grammar, and where these are ruined by erroneous endings and can be corrected, even from inferior manuscripts, Robinson does not hesitate to make the correction. He has based his text on a collation of all printed materials, with the help, in some cases, of photostats, or even of the MSS. themselves. The result cannot claim to be in the strictest sense a "critical" text, and in the *Canterbury Tales*, Mr. Manly's forthcoming publication of the full apparatus will doubtless compel changes here and there, as it will settle many vexed questions of readings now more or less doubtful. But it is not likely that the changes required will be either numerous or important. Meanwhile, for Chaucer's greatest work Robinson has given a text at once readable and sound.

The *Troilus*, of course, is more difficult, for here we have to do with two, or three, stages of composition. Professor Robinson has found McCormick and Root's description and classification of the manuscripts "thorough and trustworthy," but he does not agree that more than two stages of composition can be identified,  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ ; the so-called  $\beta$  readings he thinks are merely scribal variants and of no authority. Accordingly, although, like Root, he bases his text on *Corpus*, a  $\gamma$  MS., he rejects all  $\beta$  readings. The resulting text, therefore, differs slightly from Root's, but the differences are trifling. Here again Robinson has corrected obviously "wrong" grammatical forms and has normalized the spelling, in this case to

conform to the orthography of his basic MS., *Corpus*. To all this textual purists may object — what becomes, then, of a critical text? What, indeed? But to the writer, at least, it is clear that the editor of a working edition has no other course. The purist will have to read the MSS. or reproductions of them, or sit with Robinson's text on one side of him and a battery of critical apparatus on the other, bobbing his head incessantly back and forth like the Pardoner's "dowve sitting on a berne." But the reader who wishes to gain an adequate notion of Mr. Robinson's treatment of the text must be referred to the relevant section of the Introduction (pp. xxxii-xi) and to the textual notes to the several poems (pp. 1000-1048). An excellent specimen of his method, however, is his treatment of the text of the *Parlement of Foules* (pp. xxxv-xxxvi).

The merits of Professor Robinson's text are no doubt a matter of debate; there can be no doubt at all about the excellence of his introduction and notes. They constitute, indeed, a first-rate compendium of Chaucer scholarship to which even experts will turn for guidance and information. Nor is it merely a matter of bibliographical completeness. Mr. Robinson knows indeed what the Germans delightfully call the "literature" of the subject, but all this vast maze of scholarship has been cleared and ordered so that even a novice can find his way; and purely as literary criticism they are often admirable; witness, for example, the introduction to the *Troilus* (pp. 449-453), where his learning, sanity of judgment, and rare critical powers are happily combined. Mr. Robinson rarely slips, and I have noted no errors or omissions of consequence. But Hinkley's interesting note on "the grete Emetreus, the kyng of Inde" (A 2156) should certainly have been mentioned; and it is a pity that editors of Chaucer continue to ignore the late Mr. C. L. Kingsford's *Prejudice and Promise in the Fifteenth Century*, the fourth chapter of which, "The West Country Piracy," is a perfect commentary on the Shipman. Mr. Robinson speaks (p. xxiii) of the "socalled Lollard Knights . . . Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir William Neville, Sir John Clanvowe, and Sir Richard Stury." But were these men in any real sense followers of Wyclif? Waugh has shown, I think, that the term is a misnomer which had best be abandoned (*Scottish Historical Review*, 11, 58-63; 88-92). Nor does there seem to be any good reason for writing Thomas à Becket for the simple — and correct — Thomas Becket (p. 752). And it is quite certain that Thomas Chaucer was not Chief Butler under Richard II: he was first appointed by letters-patent of November 5, 1402. In passing, one is glad to note that Mr. Robinson dismisses the fantastic theory, lately revived by Mr. Krauss, that Thomas was the illegitimate son of Philippa Chaucer, begotten in an incestuous liaison with John of Gaunt, a piece of modern scandal-mongering to which Mr. Manly administers the quietus in an article in the current (July 1934) number of the *Review of English Studies*. Finally

I must express my regret that Mr. Robinson persists in the old Harvard heresy, elsewhere completely abandoned, that the M. E. diphthong variously spelled *ei*, *ey*, *ai*, *ay* was pronounced [ei]. English and Continental scholars hold that the sound was [ai], and the correctness of this view was demonstrated by Professor Malone as long ago as 1926 ("Studies in English Phonology, II," *Modern Philology*, xxiii, 483-490). And in this connection it is well to call attention to Jespersen's contention that the Old and Middle English *nomina agentis* in *-ster(e)*, for example *tappestere* (A 241), were from the first used of both sexes, and are not specifically feminine (*Linguistica*, 420-429, reprinted from *MLR.*, April, 1927). The argument is not entirely convincing, but it ought to restrain teachers from the usual confident etymologizing when they come upon these words in the text.

I have found only a very few misprints; though on this score one can speak with confidence only after long and steady use. But a few I have noted: *synbben* (A 523), read *snybben*; *yowe* (A 3178) read *ynowe*; p. 754a, 1369 read 1359; p. 952a, *June 14, 1382*, read *January 14, 1382*; p. 800b, *Mr. C. R. Case*, so twice, read *Kase*; p. 800b, Mr. Robinson here says that he has included the so-called Man of Law's Epilogue, but has enclosed it in brackets; but the brackets have been omitted in the text (p. 90). Errors of this sort, however, are rare, and the publishers are to be congratulated on an admirable piece of printing and book-making. The volume runs to over 1170 pages, but it is not over-bulky; the paper is good, the letter-press attractive, and the binding, as far as I can tell from some weeks of hard use, durable.

Professor Robinson's edition has been long in coming, but it was well worth waiting for, and there will be general agreement, I think, that it will hold its own for many a long day as the standard edition of Chaucer's works. The Horatian maxim has been vindicated once more.

M. B. RUUD

*The University of Minnesota*

*Chaucer's Use of Proverbs.* By BARTLETT JERE WHITING. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. 297. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, XI.

Dr. Whiting's volume contains a greater wealth of material than the title suggests. To the proverbs in Chaucer are added those in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, in the poems of Deschamps, and in the *fabliaux*. There is also a list of line references to the proverbial material in Gower's French works. Though the proverbs from all these sources have, as Dr. Whiting says, been listed before, his collections are fuller than any others.

This material is not limited to proverbs proper, but includes sententious remarks and proverbial phrases, the latter being subdivided into comparisons (*e. g.*, "brown as a berye," "crewel as lyoun"), and others (*e. g.* "thou shalt make castels thanne in Spayne," "to don thyn eris glowe"). Both the comparisons and the other proverbial phrases are arranged alphabetically under the most important word in the phrase. The proverbs and sententious remarks, grouped according to the work in which they occur, are frequently accompanied by comments indicating the speaker and the situation which evoked them.

According to Dr. Whiting's count, the 41,987 extant lines of Chaucer contain 187 proverbs, 421 sententious remarks, 372 comparisons and 258 proverbial phrases. For the sake of simplicity and to avoid debatable distinctions between proverbs and sententious remarks, we may total these figures as 608 aphorisms and 630 proverbial phrases. Deschamps, in something over 80,000 lines, has 180 aphorisms and 183 proverbial phrases. Gower, in the 33,444 lines of the *Confessio Amantis*, has 274 aphorisms and 178 proverbial phrases. These figures are not uninteresting as affording a basis of comparison. Dr. Whiting states that "No other poet of repute has made so considerable a use of proverbial material as Chaucer." He also demonstrates the fact that for his generous use of proverbs the poet found a precedent in the *ballades* of Deschamps and in the *fabliaux*. Chaucer's debt to the rhetoricians in this respect Dr. Whiting considers slight.

From studying in their context the proverbial dicta in Chaucer and in the *Confessio Amantis*, Dr. Whiting reaches the following conclusions. In contrast to Chaucer, Gower rigorously excludes proverbs from his stories and employs them chiefly to point a moral. Chaucer employs them in all types of composition, seldom didactically, often humorously, and chiefly for purposes of characterization or of narrative—to cap a climax and to emphasise or prepare for a situation. The last of these statements—that Chaucer used proverbs chiefly as aids to narration and characterization—does not appear to follow inevitably from the evidence presented and is not wholly convincing. There are signs that Chaucer used proverbs chiefly for their own sake. They are distributed through almost all his works: in *Troilus and Cressida* over fifty<sup>1</sup> appear which are not found in *Il Filostrato*; and at the end of the *Manciple's Tale* there is a string of them which contributes nothing either to story or character. To these matters Dr. Whiting has drawn attention. It may further be observed that Chaucer, who usually took pains to assign the Canterbury tales "in character," allotted to himself the so-called tale of Melibee, which is in reality a close-packed and extensive collection of aphorisms bound to-

<sup>1</sup> Whiting lists 61 inserted proverbs in *Troilus*. I have noted over 100.

gether by the slenderest thread of narrative. All this would seem to suggest that Chaucer used proverbs chiefly because he liked them and recognized that his audience also would appreciate their meatiness and memorableness.

Although Dr. Whiting's collection of Chaucer's aphorisms is much fuller than any previous one, his total of 608 reveals that it is far from complete. Some of his omissions are surprising. For instance, a saying of which there are several Chaucerian versions is given in the *Troilus* form: "Thynk nat on smert, and thou shalt fele non,"<sup>2</sup> but is omitted in the form in which it occurs in *Boece*,<sup>3</sup> partly as translation and partly as Chaucer's own gloss: "Nothing is wrecchid but whan thou wenest it. (*As who seith, thou thiself, ne no wyght ellis, nis a wrecche but whanne he weneth hymself a wrecche by reputacion of his corage*)." It is also omitted in the form in which it occurs in the *Romaunt*:<sup>4</sup> "Is no man wrecched, but he it wen"; and in *Fortune*:<sup>5</sup> "No man is wrecched, but himself it wene." Other cases of repetition have, however, been noted, and this saying is of particular interest in view of its kinship with Hamlet's famous dictum: "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." Again, Dr. Whiting notes that the line "Of poynaunt sauce had hir neded never a del"<sup>6</sup> contains a reference to the proverb "Hunger is the best sauce," but he fails to note that the warning "Beth war . . . negligence in chastyng,"<sup>7</sup> addressed to parents, refers to the Biblical proverb of which the popular form is "Spare the rod, and spoil the child." It is also difficult to see why "Gret reste stant in litel besynesse,"<sup>8</sup> a saying found among the *Prouerbis of Wysdom*<sup>9</sup> and in Skelton,<sup>10</sup> should be ignored in a list claiming to be inclusive rather than exclusive, while "Litel jangling causeth muchel reste"<sup>11</sup> is recorded. But the collecting of Chaucer's proverbs appears to be a never-ending task. To Haeckel's supposedly complete list Andrea added over 160, and to these results combined Dr. Whiting has added still further. We find, however, that the omissions mentioned here are only a few of at least 150 in the section on Chaucer's aphorisms alone. This in turn adds to Dr. Whiting's total, so that in considering his conclusions as to Chaucer's use of proverbs one must realize that they are based on substantially less than the whole of the available evidence.

Had Dr. Whiting followed the example of two earlier collectors of Chaucer's proverbs, Skeat and Mrs. Haweis, in supplying a finding-index, the value of his work to scholars would have been greatly

<sup>2</sup> P. 67.

<sup>3</sup> Camb. ed., bk. II, pr. 4, l. 22.

<sup>4</sup> B fragment, l. 5672.

<sup>5</sup> L. 25.

<sup>6</sup> P. 125.

<sup>7</sup> *CT.*, VI, 97-98.

<sup>8</sup> *Truth*, l. 10.

<sup>9</sup> L. 57, ed. Zupitza, *Archiv*, 90, 254.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Dyce, I, 417, 1410.

<sup>11</sup> P. 129.

enhanced. Yet *Chaucer's Use of Proverbs* will be of service if it arouses interest in a literary phenomenon of which the full significance and far-reaching influence have still to be revealed.

MARGARET GALWAY

New York University

*Chaucer's Shipman's Tale: The Lover's Gift Regained.* By JOHN WEBSTER SPARGO. FF. Communications, No. 91. Helsinki, 1930.

Two things never change in this shifting world: human nature and the stories men tell. And it is perhaps not the least of the services of the modern folklorist that he has made us aware of how constant these stories are from China to Peru, from the days of the Caliphs to the reign of Mr. Roosevelt. That the *Shipman's Tale* is a *fabliau* is plain on the face of it, and was, as usual, pointed out long ago by the admirable Tyrwhitt; moreover, the presence of two analogues, one of them very close, in the *Decamerone* is evidence that, like the plots of most *fabliaux*, the *motif* has wandered long and far over the face of the earth. Tyrwhitt was not deceived by the similarity between Boccaccio's tale (*Decamerone* VIII, 1) and the *Shipman's Tale*. "This tale," he wrote, "is generally supposed to be taken from the *Decameron*, Day 8, Novella 1, but I should rather believe that Chaucer was obliged to some old French Fableour, from whom Boccace had also borrowed the groundwork of his novel." But no one followed up his clue, and our knowledge still remains where Tyrwhitt left it in 1775, hovering uncertainly over that lost *fabliau*.

Chaucerians might be willing to leave it at that; not so your modern student of folklore, if he could run down so much as a single elusive cognate. And now we have Mr. Spargo's admirable study of a theme which, if less fruitful than Mr. Griffith's exploration of the Cupid and Psyche *motif*, reveals once more, and no less strikingly, the curious ways of stories—springing up no one knows where or when or how, wandering along hidden paths, falling now and then into the hands of an artist like Boccaccio, only to resume once more their journeyings in oral tradition.

Mr. Spargo disposes quickly of any notion that Chaucer may have got his plot from *Decamerone* VIII, 1 or 2. *The Shipman's Tale* belongs to a type more simple in plot than Boccaccio's: indeed, it is probable that both authors may have started with essentially the same story, which Boccaccio then developed in the direction of greater complexity of plot; whereas Chaucer, as was his way, deepened and enriched the characterization, so that the plot springs out of character, and not the other way round.

The central *motif*, as Mr. Spargo shows, is "simply a lover's gift got back from the mistress by one ruse or another." But the ruse is often complicated, other *motifs* are combined with it, and the tale takes on form and color from every age and almost every land. Numerous as the extant versions are, however, both literary and popular, they are still too few, and the relations between them generally too obscure, to make possible any coherent pattern of evolution. Mr. Spargo is content to fix the type and illustrate it, and to show some at least of its permutations and combinations. That is for the professional folklorist; but the Chaucerian will learn hardly less from the study of his monograph. He will learn something more of the materials on which the genius of Chaucer played; and even if it be true, as Mr. Spargo suggests, that Chaucer could very well have taken his story verbatim from the *fabliau*, it must still be that the air and verve of it, the pure spirit of comedy subtly interfused with real life, are his own. We should give a good deal for some pages of that old French "fableour."

MARTIN B. RUUD

*The University of Minnesota*

*Cleanness, Glossary and Illustrative Texts. Select Early English Poems IX.* Edited by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. 102.

The texts and notes of the late Sir Israel Gollancz's edition of *Cleanness* appeared in 1921 as Volume VII<sup>1</sup> in his series of Middle English alliterative poems. After a lapse of twelve years the glossary and illustrative texts appear as Volume IX. The editor's sudden death prevented him from seeing the glossary in type, and Dr. Mabel Day has supervised the publication, compiling the illustrative material from references in Part I. Besides fourteen pages of selections from the Vulgate, the main source of the poem, there are passages from Mandeville, *Le Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry*, and *Cursor Mundi*.

The glossary exhibits the careful workmanship and the wide knowledge of the alliterative vocabulary that have characterized all the editions of the series. It fittingly marks the end of the many years of loving and fruitful labor that the editor spent on the difficult poems of the alliterative school. Since obscure passages had been explained in the notes, the glossary adds little that is really new to our understanding of the poem. It is not absolutely complete, as my glossary attempted to be for all but the commonest

<sup>1</sup> Reviewed by me in *MLN.*, xxxvii (1922), 355-62.



words.<sup>2</sup> Thus under *abide* in Sir Israel's glossary, all the variant forms that appear are given, and the different meanings of the word are cited, but one instance (1673) is omitted. The citations under *also, as*, which are grouped together, occupy 9 lines to my 34. These omissions are of no importance for the immediate interpretation of the text, but the fuller citations might be of advantage to a student of the poet's usage or characteristic mannerisms as bearing on the problem of authorship.

Among improvements over my glossary are: *dampned* defined 'stified,' not 'damned,' though *NED.* does not record the verb before 1564; *relygioun* defined '(Jewish) Church' (1156), not 'religious house'; *torres*, 'tors, peak-like shapes' (951), rightly dissociated from *toures* 'towers,' the first being the Welsh *torr*, which appears even in OE. in the meaning 'rock, hill.' *Untwynes*, 'wilt destroy' (757), is shown to be correct by other examples in the *NED.* *Bau[m]e*, 'comfort,' for MS. *banne*, and *boske[n]s*, 'divisions of a cow-shed' for MS. *boskez*, both of which had appeared in the text of Part I, are important corrections. *Hezed*, 'shouted' (1854), fits the context better than my *hezede* 'hastened,' *hyze* 'hasten' elsewhere having *y*; but other instances of this verb from the interjection *hei* are lacking.

Some definitions and etymologies that seem to me incorrect, incomplete, or doubtful, may be worth brief comment. *Allyt* defined '(even) a little' is derived from OE. *on + lȳt*. In his note, the editor had translated *draw allyt* 'hesitate at all,' but both the modification 'even' to make the expression equivalent to 'at all,' and the translation of *draw* by 'hesitate' are unjustified, as Bateson's remarks in *MLR.* 19.95-7, supporting my interpretation of *allyt* as equivalent to *on lyte*, 'with delay,' clearly show. *Fele* (914) is defined 'entrust' and derived from OE. *fēolan*, though it might as well be 'make one's way,' if it ever inherits any meaning of the OE. verb. Because of other ME. and modern dialect occurrences, *fele* is usually defined 'hide,' as though from ON. *fela*, and this meaning is possible here, if one takes *upon fote* with the following clause: 'If I fele me upon fote that I fle mozt' meaning 'If I conceal myself in order to flee on foot.' In spite of the following *vp*, I see no reason to make a special case of *herzed* (1179), by defining it 'ravaged as with a harrow' rather than 'harried, plundered' from *hergian* as in 1294, 1786. *Harrow*, noun and verb, apparently never appears with 3-forms in ME. and the derivation from an OE. *\*hearge* is doubtful for other reasons. The forms of the verbs *lance*, *lauce* are difficult to disentangle; but though I may have been wrong in including the instance in 1428 under *lance* instead of *lauce*, it seems to me incorrect to include all these words under *lauce*, even 'uttered' of 668. *Norne* is probably to be asso-

<sup>2</sup> *Purity*, *Yale Studies in English*, LXI, New Haven, 1920.

ciated with Swed. dial. *norna*, *nyrna* 'inform secretly'; cf. Tolkien and Gordon's *Sir Gawain*. *Walle* in *walle-headed*, 'well-head' (364), correctly retained by the editor, is not from an OE. *weall*, but from OM. *walle*, variant of *welle*, WS. *wielle*, ME. *walle*-forms being characteristic of West Midland place-names, as Ekwall showed, *Contributions to the History of OE. Dialects*, p. 62. So the proper etymon of *malt*, inf. 'to melt,' is OM. *mæltan* (WS. *mieltan*). *Wasturne* (1674) is probably OM. *western*, ONth. *woestern*, modified by the influence of *wast*-forms from the French (so now *NED.*) *Ruþe*, 'rouse, awaken,' which occurs also in *Gawain*, is now convincingly derived by Sundén (*Jespersen Grammatical Miscellany*, pp. 117 ff.) from ON. (*h*)*ryðja*, 'fling,' pret. *hruddi*, from the stem *hrud* or *hrud* 'to put in violent motion, shake, fling.' Sundén also proposes elaborate but more doubtful etymologies for the two verbs *rothele* 'to cook, boil,' and 'to hasten.'

ROBERT J. MENNER

*Yale University*

---

*Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. By G. R. OWST.  
Cambridge: at the University Press, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. Pp. xxiv + 616. \$8.00.

Dr. Owst has produced another volume to which, from one point of view, all students of the later Middle Ages will accord the same approbation which greeted his earlier book, *Preaching in Medieval England* (1926).

It is manifestly difficult in any review to handle justly a book packed as this one is with a multitude of interesting facts and quotations. In the first chapter Dr. Owst argues for the influence of the preachers on the re-emergence of English as a literary language (pp. 3-9), and describes their attitude toward the minstrels (pp. 10-23). He goes on to give a selection of realistic references to matters of everyday life from the sermons and preachers' source books, with many quotations from Bromyard's *Summa Predican-tium* (pp. 24-40). Chapter II, "Scripture and Allegory," begins with a discussion of the four ways of interpreting the Scriptures—literal or historical, allegorical, tropological and anagogical (pp. 58 ff.). Certain favorite figures are treated at length: the Ship (pp. 68-76), which may be the Church, or the Good Man or the State,<sup>1</sup> and the Castle (pp. 77-86), which may be of God, of Man or of the Devil. The Vices and Virtues appear, and Dr. Owst argues that the allegories of Langland and Bunyan grew out of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Owst seems to have overlooked the pretty use of the Ship in Gower's *Vox Clamantis*, bk. i, caps. 17 ff.

these sermon abstractions. Chapter III, "The Heavenly Host," deals with the treatment of Biblical personages and saints in the sermons. Dr. Owst quotes descriptions of devils (p. 112 f.), which "help also to maintain a popular belief in ghosts and fairies" (p. 113), changes and adaptations of Biblical stories which show "how living and real many incidents of Scripture must have seemed to ordinary folk in the Middle Ages" (p. 117), the familiar treatment of the saints (pp. 122 ff.), and the attitude toward images and relics (pp. 137-148). There is much that is new and interesting in Dr. Owst's fourth chapter, "Fiction and Instruction in the Sermon Exempla." A few of the more general categories distinguished here by Dr. Owst are worth nothing—local (pp. 157 ff.), historical (pp. 158-161) and humorous (pp. 162 ff.) stories; personal experiences of the preacher (pp. 169 ff.); classical stories (pp. 178 ff.), some including myths and marvels (pp. 186-188); the phenomena of Nature.

The heart of the book and in many ways the most valuable part consists of the three Chapters (v, vi, vii) on the "Preaching of Satire and Complaint." The first of these traces the rise of satire in English, and makes it clear that Dr. Owst feels that the early political and satirical songs owe their origin to sermon satire (pp. 225-228). The satire of Langland, Chaucer and Gower all show influence of the sermons (pp. 228-232). Dr. Owst emphasizes the fact, not perhaps as little known as he would suggest, that Lollards and later Reformers said nothing against corruption in the Church which had not already been said, and often more pointedly, by orthodox preachers (pp. 251 ff.). Chapter vi deals with satirical attacks on other classes of society than the clergy, and Dr. Owst points out that the orthodox were as aware of the social inequalities of the day as were the Lollards (p. 289). The preachers level their attacks on pride (pp. 307-314) and avarice (pp. 315-319), which are found in all branches of lay society. The higher (pp. 320-330) and lesser (pp. 331-338) nobility, the lawyers (pp. 338-349), the physicians (pp. 349-351), the merchants (pp. 352-361) and the laborers (pp. 361-370) are pilloried for a rare variety of vices. From the faults of the various classes we pass on, in Chapter vii, to the misdemeanors of individuals, and especial attention is given to women (pp. 376 ff.). Poor and rich, fair and foul, they are certain to cause "us sely men" trouble. Love-making is vile (pp. 382-385), women don't obey their husbands (pp. 389 f.), finery is wicked (pp. 390-404), and how awful are ladies' horns! Swearing is prevalent and abominable (pp. 414-425), people haunt taverns, and drink (pp. 425-441) and eat (pp. 441-449) too much. These pages serve as a lively commentary on the sermon of Chaucer's Pardoner. There are scandal-mongers everywhere (pp. 450-458), people yield readily to wrath (pp. 458-460), and children are disobedient (pp. 460-468).

The Eighth Chapter deals with the relations between the sermon and the early drama, which Dr. Owst believes to be very close indeed.<sup>2</sup> The final chapter, "A Literary Echo of the Social Gospel," discusses in detail what Dr. Owst has hinted at often before, namely, that *Piers Plowman* consists, in the main, of sermon material cast in another form.

The summary which has been given indicates clearly the importance of this volume. It does not, however, indicate certain defects in it which distress and often confound the reader. Arrangement and style are not always clear, and the footnotes, of which there are "over two thousand five hundred" (p. xviii) are frequently difficult to read or use. A list of the manuscript sources of which Dr. Owst makes use would have served as a helpful guide. Some readers may feel that they are reminded too often and too strenuously of the importance to the history of English literature of the material which Dr. Owst is presenting. Surely every scholar should feel enthusiasm for his own problem, but even so there may be too many statements such as this: "As scholars of the future awake to their importance, it is safe to say that a revolution will be effected in our knowledge of English letters, the like of which has not been seen since the days of Thomas Warton" (p. 55). This attitude leads Dr. Owst again and again to comment unfavorably upon scholars, living and dead, who had not been sufficiently enterprising to anticipate his work. Even if some of the strictures be deserved, most readers will be affected unpleasantly by a series of contemptuous and slighting references to other scholars. One example must suffice to illustrate this unfortunate tendency: "This fastidious connoisseur [*W. P. Ker!*] who so coolly disdains the current literature of religion because it is not to his liking" (p. 217).

Then, too, readers may not feel that the often puzzling question of literary influence is always treated in a judicial fashion. Dr. Owst's method is to claim all, and the extravagance of such a procedure serves to cast doubt upon what may be valid theories. We put down the book with the feeling that everything worth while in English literature may be traced to the sermons, and must be traced to them. Independent observation of common facts, independent recourse to authorities play no part whatever. Simple secular men-of-letters needed the model of vernacular sermons to inform them that poems in English would be better understood by an English speaking people than poems in French or Latin. Satire on women, as in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, is from the sermons—as if one of the most common of literary and human phenomena had to be re-inspired for the benefit of the later Middle

<sup>2</sup> Lack of space forbids any discussion of the points raised by Dr. Owst, but the reviewer finds himself in almost complete agreement with the full and competent treatment to be found in Professor G. R. Coffman's review in *Studies in Philology*, xxi (1934), 106-109.

Ages. Because some of the *exempla* are humorous Dr. Owst (pp. 166 ff.) finds in them the direct ancestors of the *facetiae*—as if the short, humorous and usually smutty story, as old and as shameless as humanity itself, required clerical incubation and fostering. Dr. Owst speaks of literary historians who “will glibly indicate a presumed indebtedness to earlier writers of the kind with whom they may happen to be familiar, repeatedly dragging in some remote analogue from continental literature to fill any gaps in their fanciful story” (p. 211). The implications of this statement require no comment. Later he says, in discussing the Wife of Bath, “As for the straying cat and its ‘senged skin’ to which Dame Alice refers, this also is a hoary commonplace of our pulpit” (p. 389). It may well be, but it is a commonplace of Chaucerian scholarship that Chaucer took this passage, as he took much more, directly from Deschamps’s *Miroir de Mariage* (ll. 3214 f.). Clearly, and this appears all too often, the only good parallels and analogues are Dr. Owst’s. Again, Dr. Owst objects to Professor Manly’s identifications of the Pilgrims in the *Canterbury Tales* (pp. 230, 370, 386), because, of course, the pilgrims are common sermon types but he himself proceeds with relish to identify characters in *Piers Plowman* with Bishop Brunton of Rochester and Peter de la Mare (pp. 578 ff.).

One cannot avoid the feeling that, in the state of our present knowledge, the facts in this volume are of more value than the theories, but, and there can be no hesitation about this, the volume is immeasurably more than worthwhile for the facts alone.

B. J. WHITING

*Harvard University*

*Vom Wesen des Lautwandels.* Von KASPER ROGGER. Leipzig-Paris: 1933. Pp. 182. (Leipziger Romanistische Studien herausgegeben von W. von Wartburg 1/6.)

Il s’agit d’un travail de débutant qui s’attaque aux plus ardues problèmes de la science phonétique. Et il me faut avouer que ce jeune a résolu plusieurs questions que les générations antérieures n’ont pas pu tirer au clair. Je crois que la raison de ce succès est un manque de “spécialisation” (au sens néfaste du mot), la largeur de vues d’un auteur qui, en dehors d’études linguistiques, en a faites sur le domaine de la philosophie, de la psychologie, des sciences naturelles: il n’a pas buté contre des pierres qu’avaient entassées les “spécialistes des lois phonétiques.”

Je relève les idées fondamentales suivantes dans l’opuscule: la réfutation de l’hypothèse de Schuchardt au sujet des “exceptions”

de la loi phonétique: l'auteur prouve que la loi phonétique ne peut pas avoir d'exceptions (bien entendu: au moment où et dans la communauté linguistique où elle est en vigueur), parce que la transformation phonétique atteint le système entier d'une langue et n'obéit pas à l'arbitraire, mais à la transformation de ce système, qui, elle, est dictée soit par des transformations psychiques de la communauté parlante, soit par le fait même qu'elle veut reproduire les sons traditionnels. Ici j'ai la grande joie de pouvoir indiquer la convergence d'un travail personnel (que l'auteur ne pouvait pas connaître) avec le sien: J'ai publié dans les *Mélanges Salverda de Grave* (1933) un article "Zum Warum der Lautentwicklung" qui arrive à cette même conclusion: comme dans le domaine de la sémantique il y a une surenchère constante parce qu'on veut conserver la même intensité et affectivité à une expression, de même on altère les sons parce qu'on veut les rendre d'une manière identique à celle qu'on a apprise ou entendue. On innove par esprit de conservation. On emploie trop de force pour atteindre un but jugé normal. Au fond, l'évolution des sens et des sons montre l'homme s'évertuant à rester le même et par là même échouant dans sa tâche: un conservateur qui à son insu devient révolutionnaire. Il y a donc une évolution des sons inhérente à la langue, permanente, nécessaire, conditionnée par le fait même de la parler. L'évolution des sons s'explique par l'emploi du langage humain, par l'être même de l'homme. Ceci est, ce me semble, un résultat qui peut donner à penser aux philosophes—et nous saluons avec joie le progrès que ce travail bien pensé et bien rédigé a fait faire à la linguistique générale.

LEO SPITZER

Université d'Istanbul

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*A Primer of Romance Philology.* By FREDERICK ANDERSON. The Stanford University Press, 1934. 15 pp. In this pamphlet Professor Anderson of Stanford University gives a brief definition of phonetics, an outline map of language change, some facts relative to Vulgar Latin, a list of the Romance languages, notes on Romance orthography, some of the outstanding phonological changes in French, Spanish, Italian, and Provençal, an explanation of the terms syncope and apocope, and definitions of morphology, lexicology, and syntax. As not more than one or two pages can be devoted to each of these topics it will be seen that Mr. Anderson has had to spread out a vast amount of material and sift it very fine. A body of material so highly selective can seldom be used to advantage by any one save the author of the book. In his Fore-

word Mr. Anderson states the purpose of the manual: to introduce students to the literature and the main principles of Romance Philology. Unfortunately he does not include within this literature any of the recent writings by Lucien Foulet, Leo Spitzer, Carl Vossler, Giulio Bertoni, and others, who for some years now have been very active in the field. Mr. A.'s little book is introductory only to the fundamental grammars and as such it gives the appearance of having been written some twenty years ago. We should expect some discussion, at least, of the various linguistic atlases and of the importance of dialect studies. The material is quite accurate, as far as it goes. Some of us would debate the inclusion of Catalan as a dialect of Provençal, and of Sardinian as a dialect of Italian. On the change of *au* to *o* in Vulgar Latin the author might have used Racher's article in *Glotta* xvi (1928), 74-84. The book contains several references to Russian pronunciations which can hardly be useful to elementary students using this manual.

URBAN T. HOLMES

*The University of North Carolina*

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

THE DATE OF CIPERIS DE VIGNEVAUX. In *MLN.*, XLIX, 559-561 a correspondent makes the rash and quite unwarranted statement that in writing my recent study on the date of *Ciperis de Vigneaux* (*MLN.*, XLIX, 255-260) I was unaware of a certain Hungarian doctor's dissertation, the work of Mr. Viktor Machovich, dealing with this poem and published in Hungary in 1928. The truth of the matter is that I knew both author and title of the compilation but *deliberately disregarded* it, no copy being available in Washington and Baltimore.

Coming now to the correspondent's objections, let me say at once that they are largely based upon a complete misunderstanding of my text. I have nowhere 'identified' the hero of the poem with Sigismund or any other king of Hungary. My thesis is concerned with no 'identification' of any sort, for I am absolutely convinced that *chansons de geste* never were *romans à clef*. What I do claim is simply that the political situation of contemporary Europe influenced the unknown author in shaping the purely exterior aspects of his plot (or some of them), incidentally furnishing a convenient *terminus a quo* for the dating of the poem. No one now accepts Claude Fauchet's tentative dating, and Paulin Paris expressed the utmost diffidence about a dating of *Ciperis de Vigneaux* on internal criteria—for obvious reasons.

As for the city of Moron(s), Prof. Alfons Hilka, in a communication of March 24, 1934, drew my attention to the occurrence of the same city under the name of *Magerone* (as the capital of Hungary) in *Florimont*. He

suggests that the name is possibly connected with *Madjar*, the national name of the Hungarians. As for the Dalmatian *Maronia*, it also occurs in *Florimont* as *Moriainz*, evidently in spite of the 'tremendous' distances which separate Hungary proper from the Dalmatian coast.<sup>1</sup> Since I have never claimed that the author of *Oiperis de Vignevaux* was a specialist in Hungarian geography, I fail to see how geographical blunders of his can defeat my thesis. To serious students *Boude* was known as the capital of Hungary long before Nicopolis, but as I have said, the unknown poet certainly did not belong to this class. Nor was he bound (as I have expressly stated in my article) to reproduce all the details of royal relationships by birth or marriage, even had he known them, for, I repeat, he wrote no *roman à clef*. As for other Hungarian kings related by marriage to Roman emperors before the Hapsburg era, they may safely be considered to have been as completely forgotten in fifteenth century France as they are to-day—save by professional historians and genealogists. The correspondent's remarks on the point are therefore singularly irrelevant.

It is claimed furthermore that there was no immediate danger threatening Hungary from the Turks when the French set out to aid Sigismund. The remark is cryptic: the danger threatening Hungary's very existence began when the Osmanli Turks defeated the Serbs at Kosovo polje in 1389; it ended with the heroic defense of Vienna by Rüdiger von Starhemberg in 1683. All crusades undertaken in the interim by Western and Central Europe had only one aim, to avert that danger. Sigismund's campaign had no other object.

I have nowhere claimed that the battle of Nicopolis was represented as a 'great national victory': the Europeans of the fifteenth century were not yet the expert 'propagandists' they are in the twentieth! Nor does the campaign in the poem reflect Sigismund's unlucky venture. Once more, *chansons de geste* are no *romans à clef*. The author places his poem moreover in Merovingian times! One may even conceivably argue that after the disaster he would console his readers by describing glorious victories of old, won in the same region (just as after 1870 the glories of the French Revolution and the First Empire were revived in France), the tacit understanding being, of course, that the wheel of Fortune might well turn once more! Besides, even the dating of the poem preferred by the correspondent (about 1350) would place its composition on the day after a terrible national disaster (Crécy, 1346). So his objection is pointless.

The last observation of the correspondent strikes me as sound: I do believe that had the poem been written after 1410, it probably would contain some reference to Philippe's elevation to the imperial throne. I am therefore inclined to regard 1410 rather than 1415 as its probable *terminus ante quem*.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

Washington, D. C.

---

<sup>1</sup> In reality this 'tremendous' distance: Budapest-Spalato is not quite 250 miles!



REPLY. My only excuse for a "rash and quite unwarranted statement" in presuming that Professor Krappe was unaware of Machovich's thesis, is my taking for granted that contributors to a learned periodical would not "*deliberately disregard*" the work of a predecessor, especially if it is of capital importance to their subject. My innocence led me to believe that research was not confined to books available in Washington and vicinity, and that writers with claims to erudition feel obliged to devote a footnote to titles of works to which they had no access. At any rate, until the author of the attempted hypothesis carefully examines the thesis, which was briefly reviewed in *Revue des Etudes hongroises* XI (1933), 130, his counter-objections ought not in justice to be answered.

Still, his remarks contain too glaring misstatements to be overlooked. His approach to the problem is best characterized by his assertion that the Budapest-Spalato distance is "not quite 250 miles" when a simple check-up through the Information Bureau of the Hungarian Government in New York City would have furnished him with the official data according to which the distance is no less than 430 miles. He manifestly contradicts himself when averring in his article that the motifs of *Ciperis* "echo" the life and doings of a Hungarian king related to the German emperor, and claims in his counter-objections that no identification was intended. My "singularly irrelevant" remarks were meant to demonstrate that the fabulous Phillipe of the poem bears no single trait of any authentic king of Hungary. Family relationships of Hungarian royalty were less unknown in France than Professor Krappe imagines. Ten years before the battle of Nicopolis, Eustache Deschamps visited Hungary as member of a delegation whose mission was to attempt to conclude a marriage between a son of Charles VI of France and that very daughter of Louis the Great of Hungary whom Sigismund actually married (cf. G. Birkás' article, *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* XLII (1918), 361 ss.). The statement on the Turkish wars, too, is misleading. In 1683, the Turks were no longer "a danger threatening Hungary's very existence" as at least two-thirds of that country had been in the actual possession of the Turks for about a hundred years, Hungary's destiny having been sealed by the mournful debacle of Mohacs (1526). The reference to the battle of Crécy is pointless; *Ciperis* had clearly nothing to do with it. The argument as to the identity of Morons is irrelevant; I merely contended that it could not be identified with the actual capital of Hungary. I conclude by observing that calling four years' period "a day" is a daring hyperbole.

ARPAD STEINER

Hunter College

---

REJOINDER. The 'capital' importance of Machovich's compilation may be gauged from the fact (unknown, it seems, to the correspondent) that it has so far been ignored by every Romance periodical in the world. I also wonder whether the correspondent has ever heard of the exchange system of doctor's dissertations existing between most universities of good repute, i. e., if the dissertations are worth the exchange! My geographical knowl-

edge, like that of most mortals, is derived from the common atlas (Budapest-Spalato, not quite 500 kilometers as the crow flies), not from the 'Information' Bureau of a foreign government! I have nowhere claimed that *Oiperis* 'echoes' the life and doings of any Hungarian king: I expressly stated that *chansons de geste* are no *romans à clef*. Since the correspondent does not appear to know the implication of the latter term I believe it useless to labor the point further. It would be a mere waste of your valuable space to discuss the rest of the correspondent's remarks: the readers may safely be left to do them full justice.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

Washington, D. C.

---

CHATEAUBRIAND, SHAW, and SANNAZARO. Dr. Chandler Beall points out in *MLN.*, XLVII (1932), 509-10, that a Latin quotation in the *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*, x, 159 (éd. Ladvocat), is from Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis*, II, 214-19, and suggests that Chateaubriand owed his knowledge of it to an annotated edition of *Jerusalem Delivered*. The latter hypothesis, which B. restates in his valuable investigation, *Chateaubriand et le Tasse* (Baltimore, 1934, p. 70), is unlikely, as Chateaubriand admits (*Itinéraire*, x, 2) that he had dispensed with reading *Jerusalem Delivered* in the original, and as I am reasonably certain, after a careful comparison of texts, that he utilized for the French quotations Lebrun's translation (Paris, 1774), and for the Italian citations that of Panckoucke-Framéry (Paris, 1785). It is much more probable that Chateaubriand owed the Sannazaro reference to the *Voyages de Monsieur Shaw, M. D. dans plusieurs provinces de la Barbarie et du Levant . . .* (La Haye, Jean Neaulme, 1743), from which he gleaned passage after passage, and which reproduces from Sannazaro exactly the six lines (I, 191) in question. B. also indicates in his article that Tasso imitates Sannazaro in the famous lines of the *Gerusalemme liberata*:

Giace l'alta Cartago; a pena i segni  
De l'alte sue rüine il lido serba, etc.

and concludes that this stanza "may have conditioned Chateaubriand's manner of perceiving the 'ruines si peu apparentes que je les distinguois à peine du sol.'" Undoubtedly Chateaubriand knew his *Jerusalem Delivered*, but, had his memory failed him, Shaw again would have reminded him of the picture of ruins with his quotation, in a footnote on the opposite page (I, 190), of these very lines of Tasso. It seems then reasonable to suppose that it was Shaw who brought to Chateaubriand's attention the quotations from these two Italians.

EMILE MALAKIS

University of Pennsylvania

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

JUNE, 1935

Number 6

---

## PROVERBS AND PROVERBIAL ALLUSIONS IN MARLOWE

The Case edition of Marlowe's works notes so few proverbs or proverbial allusions in Marlowe's seven plays and his *Hero and Leander* as to make it seem that he rejected in the main this favorite Elizabethan device of introducing wit and wisdom in his writings. A reading of his plays and *Hero and Leander* to determine whether this were true, or whether unnoted proverbs might be added to those previously identified, reveals that the editors of his works, up to and including the editors of the Case edition, have underestimated his use of proverbial material.<sup>1</sup>

In subsequent paragraphs in this article are given the detailed results of this rereading of Marlowe. They show that to the six proverbs in *The Jew of Malta* and the single proverb in *Edward II* previously identified<sup>2</sup> are to be added 3, in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*; 1, in *I Tamburlaine*; 4, in *II Tamburlaine*; 4, in *Doctor Faustus*; 11, in *The Jew of Malta*; 8, in *Edward II*; and 4, in *Hero and Leander*.<sup>3</sup> None were found in *The Massacre at Paris*.

<sup>1</sup> The term "proverb" in this article is used in its inclusive Elizabethan sense to embrace both popular and learned sayings, whether of native or foreign origin.

<sup>2</sup> In the Case edition of Marlowe's works six proverbs in *The Jew of Malta* and one in *Edward II* have been noted. In the former the proverbs are: "Of naught is nothing made" (I, ii, 105, p. 54); "Sufferance breeds ease" (I, ii, 239, p. 61); "Blame not me but the proverb Confess and be hanged" (IV, ii, 18-19, p. 126); "Yes, sir; the proverb says, he that eats with the devil had need of a long spoon" (III, iv, 54-55, p. 111); "I'll not have him worth a gray groat" (IV, iv, 122, p. 136); and "Love me little, love me long" (IV, vi, 28, p. 143). In *Edward II*, the proverb noted is, "For now we hold an old wolf by the ears" (V, ii, 7, p. 184).

<sup>3</sup> Two of the Marlowe quotations in this article, not proverbial in character, are omitted from this count (*Edward II*, II, ii, 201-202; and *Hero and Leander*, I, 299-302).

In rejecting "such conceits as clownage keeps in pay," Marlowe excluded from his plays, for the greater part, certain types of lowly characters and other types in Elizabethan plays that delight in proverbs. As a result, the witty use of proverbs to enliven the dialogue, so frequently found in Shakespeare and other Elizabethan dramatists, is lacking almost altogether in Marlowe. Marlowe's employment of proverbs, as one would expect from the serious nature of his plays, is confined mainly to those "old truths" in which his characters find support for their views or comfort for their woes. In this connection it is noteworthy that a considerable number of his sayings are classical in origin rather than native, and are given, at times, in their Latin form, although English translations of the same proverbs were not uncommon in his day. Had Marlowe also written comedies instead of confining himself to plays of a tragic character—as he might have done had he lived longer—it is likely that he would have employed more proverbs in the lighter manner in which Pilia-Borza employs two proverbs in *The Jew of Malta*.<sup>4</sup>

#### DIDO, QUEEN OF CARTHAGE<sup>5</sup>

P. 152 (II, i, 84-85). "*Dido*. Aeneas is Aeneas, were he clad In weeds as bad as ever Irus wore." In *The Jew of Malta* (IV, vi, 10), Marlowe has "A man's a man." These words of Marlowe's in *The Jew of Malta* are a shortened form of the proverb, "A man is a man, though he have but a hose on his head" (Apperson, p. 394). Apperson<sup>6</sup> thinks that this proverb "may mean that a man is not to be judged by his apparel, however grotesque that may be." In the passage in *Dido*, Marlowe, by completely rephrasing the proverb, confirms the correctness of Apperson's interpretation of its meaning.

P. 185 (III, iii, 63-65). "*Iar*. Ay, this it is which wounds me to the death, To see a Phrygian, *far-fet* o' the sea, Preferr'd before a man of majesty." In referring in this passage to Dido's preference for Aeneas "*far-fet* o' the sea," Marlowe alludes to the proverb, "*Far-fet* and dear

<sup>4</sup> For Pilia-Borza's use of proverbs in this manner see *The Jew of Malta*, III, iv, 54-55: "He that eats with the devil had need of a long spoon"; and, IV, iv, 21: "Hodie tibi, cras mihi."

<sup>5</sup> The page references to passages quoted from Marlowe's works in this article are to *The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe*, General Editor: R. H. Case.

<sup>6</sup> G. L. Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*, London and New York, 1929. References to this, and other works in this article (with one exception noted in footnote 7), will be by name of author only.

bought is good for ladies" (Apperson, p. 203, and *Elizabethan Proverb Lore*,<sup>7</sup> p. 144). Massinger in *The Guardian*, II, iv (*Works of Massinger*, ed. F. Cunningham, p. 470) has an allusion to the proverb in a situation similar to that in *Dido*: "[The man she loves is] a mere stranger, Newly arrived!—Still the more probable, Since ladies, as you know, affect strange dainties And brought far to them."

P. 223 (v, i, 165-166). "*Dido*. O serpent, that came creeping from the shore, And I for pity *harbour'd in my bosom*." These words stem from the classical proverb, "*Viperam in sinu alere*." See Otto,<sup>8</sup> p. 372; and Düringsfeld,<sup>9</sup> I, 213. The proverb is not uncommon in Shakespeare's time, although Apperson does not record it before Ray (1670).<sup>10</sup>

#### I TAMBURLAINE

P. 124 (III, ii, 96). "*Agyd*. And of extremities elect the least." This is Marlowe's version of the proverb, "Of two evils choose the least" (Apperson, p. 654; and *E. P. L.*, p. 138). See Otto (p. 207) for classical instances of the proverb.

#### II TAMBURLAINE

P. 220 (III, i, 28-31). "*Call*. proud *Fortune* who hath followed long The martial sword of mighty Tamburlaine, Will now retain her old *inconstancy* And raise our honours to as high a pitch." Marlowe here alludes to the oft-repeated sixteenth-century thought that "fortune is constant only in inconstancy." It goes back to Ovid's *Tristia* (v, viii, 18): "*Et [fortuna] tantum constans in levitate est*." For its use by John Lyly and other Elizabethans, see *E. P. L.*, p. 107. Additional examples are found in Sidney, *Arcadia*, lib. I, ch. iv (ed. Feuillerat, p. 26); Peele, *The Battell of Alcazar*, II, iii (Malone Society Reprint, sig. C i verso); Dekker, *I Honest Whore*, II, i, 400-401 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *C. E. D.*); and Marston, *The Malcontent*, I, vi, 107-108 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *C. E. D.*). Apperson does not record this recurring Elizabethan thought.

P. 227 (III, ii, 107-108). "*Tamb.* Filling their empty veins with airy wine, That, being concocted, turns to crimson blood." The idea that "wine makes blood" was proverbial. James Howell has it in his "Letter Com-

<sup>7</sup> M. P. Tilley, *Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Lyly's "Euphues" and in Pettie's "Petite Pallace"*, New York, 1926. This work will be referred to hereafter as "*E. P. L.*"

<sup>8</sup> A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig, 1890.

<sup>9</sup> Ida und Otto von Düringsfeld, *Sprichwörter der Germanischen und Romanischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1872.

<sup>10</sup> Shakespeare alludes to the proverb in *II Henry VI* (III, i, 343-344), and *Richard II* (III, ii, 131). Not noted in Jente, *The Proverbs of Shakespeare*, Washington University Studies, XIII (1926). Chapman employs it in *Bussy D'Ambois*, III, ii, 386-387 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists*).

posed of *French Proverbs*" in his *Tetraglotton*: "In the morning white wine is good, Claret at night to breed good blood." The origin of this belief can be traced to Homer (P. A. Robin, *The Old Physiology in English Literature*, pp. 107-108). The thought is repeated in *The Civile Conversation of M. Steven Guazzo*, bk. iv (Tudor Translations, II, 161); Nicholas Breton, *II Crossing of Proverbs* (ed. A. B. Grosart, II, 11); Sylvester, *The Complete Works of Joshua Sylvester* (ed. Grosart, I, 45, 588-593); *Everie Woman in her Humour* (Tudor Facsimile Text, sig. G 4 verso). Shakespeare in *Much Ado about Nothing* (I, i, 230-231), and Spenser in *The Faerie Queene* (v, vii, 10) employ it. For further examples, see P. A. Robin, *loc. cit.*; and "Good Drink Makes Good Blood," in *MLN.*, xxxix (1924), 153-155. Not in Apperson.

P. 273 (v, iii, 64-65). "*Tech.* this grief will cease, And cannot last, it is so violent." The proverb, "Nothing that is violent is permanent," occurs in collections of English proverbs, and frequently in the literature of Marlowe's time. Instances of its use by Shakespeare and others are cited in *E.P.L.*, p. 317. The proverb goes back to Aristotle, *Aristotelis Sententiae . . . Selectissimae* (1556), 71: "Nullum violentum est perpetuum." It is not in Apperson. See in this article the quotation from *The Jew of Malta* (I, i, 130-131), for a second use of the proverb by Marlowe.

P. 280 (v, iii, 238-239). "*Tamb.* The nature of these proud rebelling jades Will take occasion by the slenderest hair." The classical proverb, "Fronte capillata, post est occasio calva" (Otto, p. 249), is the source of two related English proverbs, "Occasion is bald behind" (Apperson, p. 462), and "To take time by the forelock" (Apperson, p. 635). In *E.P.L.* (p. 238), illustrations from Shakespeare and others are given. See in this article the quotation from *The Jew of Malta* (v, ii, 44), for a second allusion to the proverb by Marlowe.

#### DOCTOR FAUSTUS

P. 60 (I, i, 48-49). "*Faust.* What doctrine call you this, *che sera, sera*: 'What will be, shall be.'" Apperson (p. 560) notes the proverb, "That which shall be, shall be," from the time of Chaucer onward; and Düringsfeld (II, 200) illustrates the general currency of the proverb on the continent. It is found in *Romeo and Juliet* (IV, i, 21), not cited by Jente. As further evidence of the popularity of the proverb in Elizabethan literature, see Pettie, *A Petite Pallace* (ed. I. Gollancz, II, 128); Chettle, *Kind-Heart's Dream* (*Early English Poetry*, Percy Society ed., v, 37); Peele, *The Old Wives Tale* (ll. 62-63, in *C.E.D.*); *II Return from Parnassus*, II, v, 726-729; Nashe, *Letter to Cotton* (*Works*, v, 196, ed. McKerrow); Jonson, *Epicoene*, v, iv, 107; Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Scornful Lady*, III, i, 278-279; and *A Merrie Dialogue betweene Band, Cuffe, and Ruffe* (ed. J. O. Halliwell, p. 16). It is also found in the following collections of English proverbs: Bacon, *Promos* (ed. H. Pott, p. 525); Howell, *Italian Proverbs* in his *Tetraglotton*; Lean<sup>11</sup> (IV, 180); and G. Torriano, *Italian Proverbs*

<sup>11</sup> V. S. Lean, *Collectanea*, Bristol, 1902.

and *Proverbial Phrases* (1666, p. 81). See in this article the quotation from *Edward II* (iv, vi, 94), for a second use of the proverb by Marlowe.

P. 82 (II, i, 42). "*Meph. Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.*" The English form of this classical proverb, "Misery loves company," is repeatedly met with in Shakespeare and his contemporaries (see *E. P. L.*, p. 229; and Apperson, p. 110). Amorphus, in *Cynthia's Revels* (v, iv, 605-606), offers a variation of the proverb: "When men disgraces share, The lesser is the care."

P. 140 (iv, iii, 95). "*Fred. He must needs go that the devil drives.*" This is one of the commonest of sixteenth-century English proverbs. See Apperson, p. 440, and Jente, p. 411.

P. 142 (iv, iv, 26). "*Benv. We'll rather die with grief than live with shame.*" This is Marlowe's restatement of the Latin proverb, "*Melius est mori quam male vivere.*" See Lean, III, 432. It is also found in the following plays: Kyd, *Cornelia*, iv, ii, 133-135; *Lochrine*, iv, i, 134-135 (ed. Tucker Brooke, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*); and *Apus and Virginia* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, iv, 144). See the quotation in this article from *Edward II* (III, iii, 58-59), for a second instance in Marlowe of this proverb.

#### THE JEW OF MALTA

P. 33 (Prol., l. 27). "*Bar. Let me be envied and not pitied.*" For the proverb, "Better be envied than pitied," see Apperson, p. 42, and Düringsfeld, I, 91. Erasmus, in his *Adagia* (ed. 1703, 1044B), comments on the proverb as follows: "*Nihil tam vulgari sermone jactatum, quam haec sententia: Praestat invidiosum esse quam miserabilem. Nam invidia fere comes est felicitatis, miseratio calamitatis.*"

P. 44 (I, i, 130-131). "*Bar. and nothing violent, Oft have I heard tell, can be permanent.*" See the note in this article on *II Tamburlaine* (v, iii, 64-66), for comment on this proverb.

P. 48 (I, i, 187). "*Bar. Ego mihi met sum semper proximus.*" The English form of the proverb is, "I am nearest to myself." See *E. P. L.*, p. 235. Apperson (p. 557) records only a single late example (1913) of the proverb in a modified form: "Self first, and then your next best friend." Two instances of the proverb are found in Jonson: *Cynthia's Revels* (v, vii, 29), "as euery one is nearest to himselfe"; and *Sejanus* (iv, ii, 9-10), "the thoughts borne nearest Unto our selves, move swiftest still, and dearest."

P. 56 (I, ii, 154). "*Bar. Your extreme right does me exceeding wrong.*" The source of the proverb, "The extremity of law is extremity of wrong," is the classical quotation, "*Summum jus, summa injuria factum est jam tritum sermone proverbium*" (Cicero, *De Officiis*, i, 10). See Apperson, p. 272; and *E. P. L.*, p. 139. Further examples of its use are found in Cyril Tournear, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, I, ii (ed. J. C. Collins, p. 17); and Richard Edwards, *Damon and Pythias* (ed. J. Q. Adams, in *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*, II, 753-754).

P. 61 (I, ii, 237-238). "*Bar. No, Abigail; things past recovery Are*

hardly cur'd with exclamations." For the proverb, "Past cure past care," see Apperson, p. 484; and *E. P. L.*, p. 115.

P. 94 (II, iii, 294). "*Bar.* Win it and wear it." Illustrations of the proverb, "Win it and wear it," are given by Apperson, p. 688; *E. P. L.*, p. 326; and Jente, p. 440. Marlowe employs the proverb in his version of a line in Ovid's *Elegia* (II, xii, 13): "I, guide and soldier, *won the field and wear her.*" The thought expressed in the proverb does not occur in the Latin.

P. 131 (IV, iv, 21). "*Pilia.* whom I saluted with an old hempen proverb, *Hodie tibi, cras mihi.*" Apperson (p. 637) cites the proverb, "Today me, tomorrow thee," from the thirteenth century on.

P. 142 (IV, vi, 10). "*Ith.* Rivo Castiliano! *A man's a man.*" See the note in this article on *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (II, i, 84-85), for comment on this proverb.

P. 142 (IV, vi, 14). "*Ith.* Do nothing; but *I know what I know*; he's a murderer." The proverb, "I know what I know," is a shortened form of Heywood's older proverb, "I wot what I wot, though I few words make." See Apperson, p. 714. James Howell includes the proverb in his *Tetraglotton*, p. 18. It is found in one form or another in five of Shakespeare's plays: *The Comedy of Errors* (III, i, 11); *All's Well That Ends Well* (V, iii, 253); *Measure for Measure* (III, ii, 156); *Othello* (V, ii, 301); and *King Lear* (I, v, 16). It also occurs in the following Elizabethan dramas: *Three Ladies of London* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, VI, 310); *The True Chronicle History of King Leir* (Tudor Facsimile Text, C 3 verso); Chettle, Haughton, and Dekker's *Patient Grisill* (Tudor Facsimile Text, K 2 recto); *Club Law*, II, ii, 705-706 (ed. G. C. M. Smith); *The London Prodigal*, III, ii, 118-120 (ed. Tucker Brooke, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*); Thomas Heywood, *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*, II, iii (ed. W. J. Blew, pp. 91-92); Day, *Humour out of Breath* (ed. A. H. Bullen, III, p. 33); and Rowley, *A Match at Midnight*, II, i (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, XIII, 28). The proverb is also found in John Tatham, *The Rump* (II, i, p. 22); and in *The Bragadocio* (p. 40, ed. 1691). Not in Jente.

P. 154 (V, ii, 44). "*Bar.* Begin betimes; Occasion's bald behind." See the note in this article on *II Tamburlaine* (V, iii 238-239), for comment on the proverb.

P. 155 (V, ii, 72-73). "*Bar.* For, as a friend not known but in distress, I'll rear up Malta, now remediless." Apperson (p. 237), under the proverb, "A friend is never known till a man have need," cites examples of the proverb from 1303 on. See Lean, III, 385.

#### EDWARD II

P. 77 (I, i, 142-143). "*K. Edw.* Why shouldst thou kneel? knowest thou not who I am? *Thy friend, thyself, another Gaveston!*" This alludes to the Latin proverb, "*Amicus alter ipse.*" Shakespeare, in addition to his allusion to this proverb in *Hamlet* (I, ii, 161), employs it in *Richard III* (II, ii, 151-152): "My other self, my counsel's consistory, My oracle, my prophet!" In addition to the examples cited in *E. P. L.* (p. 164), it is



found in *The Spanish Tragedy*, II, iv, 9; *The First Part of Jeronimo* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, iv, 354); *The Taming of a Shrew*, I, i, 8; *Wily Beguiled* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, ix, 248, and ix, 281); and *Fuimus Troes* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, xii, 530). Apperson does not record the proverb.

P. 99 (I, iv, 284). "*Mor. jun.* But cannot brook a night-grown mushroom." The proverb, "In one night grows a mushroom," referring to an upstart, is included in several sixteenth- and seventeenth-century collections. See *E. P. L.*, p. 233. This proverb is not in Apperson.

P. 105 (I, iv, 406). "*Mor. jun.* He wears a lord's revenue on his back." John Clarke, in his *Paroemiologia Anglo-Latina* (1639), p. 262, has the proverb, "He wears a whole Lordship on his back." As noted in the Case edition, the thought occurs twice in Shakespeare.

P. 124 (II, ii, 201-202). "*K. Edw.* Yet, shall the crowing of these cockerels Affright a lion?" The lion's fear of the cock goes back to Pliny, *Natural History* (bk. VIII, ch. 16, and bk. x, ch. 21, ed. Holland) and Plutarch, *Morals* (II, 96, ed. W. W. Godwin). The same idea is repeated by Bartholomew Anglicus and Thomas Lupton (H. W. Seager, *Natural History in Shakespeare's Time*, pp. 66, 184, 185). Erasmus assisted in popularizing the belief in England through his *Similia*: "Leo cunctis formidatum animal, cantum ac cristam galli formidat" (p. 611B, ed. 1703). The thought is found in Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois*, I, ii, 168-169; Dekker, *Match Me in London* (ed. John Pearson, iv, 178); Wilson, *Belphegor* (see Lean, III, 393); Dekker, *The Raven's Almanacke* (Huth Library Series, iv, 172); Melbancke, *Philotimus* (p. 31, ed. 1583); and Scott, *Discovery of Witchcraft* (p. 70, ed. 1654). The seventeenth century, skeptical of the belief, has recorded the fact that the lion is not frightened by the cock. See Lodge, *A Learned Summary upon the Famous Poems of William of Saluste Lord of Bartas*, p. 243; Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (III, xxvii, 7); and Emma Phipson, *The Animal-Lore of Shakespeare's Time*, p. 225. Because of increasing skepticism this one time "old truth" did not find its way into collections of English proverbs.

P. 143 (III, ii, 79-80). "*Q. Isab.* Ah, boy! this towardness makes thy mother fear Thou art not mark'd to many days on earth." This is an allusion to the proverb, "The good die young." See Apperson, p. 254; Lean, iv, 166; Jente, p. 441; and *E. P. L.*, p. 170.

P. 151 (III, iii, 58-59). "*Lan.* The worst is death, and better die to live Than live in infamy under such a king." Professor Briggs, as cited in the Case ed., has noted the classical origin of this thought. See the quotation from *Doctor Faustus* (iv, iv, 26), for comment on this proverb.

P. 170 (iv, vi, 8). "*K. Edw.* Father, thy face should harbour no deceit." This is an allusion to the belief in Elizabeth's day that a man's heart could be read in his face. This belief gave rise to the proverb, "The face is index to the heart," a thought which is found repeatedly in Shakespeare. See Apperson, p. 198.

P. 174 (iv, vi, 94). "*K. Edw.* Well, that shall be, shall be." See the note in this article on *Doctor Faustus* (I, i, 48-49), for comment on this proverb.

Pp. 185-186 (II, v, 83-85). "War. is it not enough That we have taken him, but must we now Leave him on '*had I wist*,' and let him go?" The proverb alluded to in the words printed in italics is "Beware of *had I wist*." See Apperson, p. 277; *E. P. L.*, p. 77; and Lean, II, 719.

#### HERO AND LEANDER

P. 39 (I, 209-211). "This sacrifice (whose sweet perfume descending From Venus' altar to your footsteps bending) Doth testify that you exceed her far." These lines are based on the proverb, "Smoke follows the fairest." See Apperson, p. 581; and Lean, II, 608. Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (v, xxii, 8), says: "That smoak doth follow the fairest, is . . . the continuation of a very ancient opinion, as Petrus Victorius and Casaubon have observed from a passage in Athenaeus."

P. 40 (I, 231). "Vessels of brass oft handled, brightly shine." Professor Martin (*Hero and Leander*, Case ed.) has pointed out the source of this passage in Ovid, *Elegia*, I, viii, 51. Erasmus employs the proverb in his *Similia* (p. 563F, ed. 1703) in the form "ferrum, aut aes usu splendescit." In *Euphues*, Lyly has, "Iron the more it is used the brighter it is." See *E. P. L.*, p. 196. Further instances of the proverb are found in Constable's *Diana*, Sonnet x (*Elizabethan Sonnets in An English Garner*, ed. Sidney Lee, II, 95): "Iron with wearing shines"; and in Dekker, *Westward Ho*, iv, ii (*The Works of John Webster*, ed. Dyce, p. 233), "Beauty, like gold, being us'd becomes more bright."

P. 41 (I, 255). "One is no number." The proverb does not occur in this form in the older collections of English proverbs, but Apperson (p. 472) cites instances of its occurrence in literature from 1539 on. Further examples are found in Lyly, *Midas*, III, i, 31-33 (ed. Bond, III, 130); Shakespeare, *Sonnet 136*, l. 8; Drummond, *Kisses Desired* (note to Shakespeare, *Sonnet 8*, l. 14, Eng. Ard. ed.); and Dekker, *II Honest Whore*, iv, i, 349-351 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *C. E. D.*).

P. 44 (I, 299-302). "The rites In which love's beauteous empress most delights, Are banquets, Doric music, mid-night revel, Plays, masques, and all that stern age counteth evil." This quotation is strikingly similar to passages in Lyly,<sup>12</sup> Spenser,<sup>13</sup> Shakespeare,<sup>14</sup> and Marston.<sup>15</sup> The similarity

<sup>12</sup> Venus. Ile haue her wittie, quick, and amorous,  
Delight in reuels and in banqueting,  
Wanton discourses, musicke, and merry songs.

*The Woman in the Moon*, III, ii, 1-4.

<sup>13</sup> [Venus]. So my delight is all in ioyfulnessse,  
In beds, in bowres, in banckets, and in feasts:

*Faerie Queene*, III, vi, 22.

<sup>14</sup> *Berowne*. For revels, dances, and merry hours,  
Forerun fair Love, strewing her way with flowers.

*Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, iii, 376-7.

<sup>15</sup> Loves only empress  
Whose kingdom rests in wanton revelling.

*Pygmalion*, II. 134-5.

of these four passages is to be accounted for rather by independent re-workings of a common source than by the borrowing of one poet from another. Apperson does not record the thought as proverbial. Erasmus assisted in giving this classic thought currency in England. In his *Similia* (p. 587F, ed. 1703), with Plutarch noted as his source, he has: "Amor levatur cantu, corollis, osculis." Marlowe's mention of the "stern age" that "counteth evil" the "rites in which love's beauteous empress most delights" has reference to such views on the subject as are expressed by Vives in his *Eruditio mulieris christianae* (bk. I, ch. 14), and quoted by Northbrooke in *A Treatise against Dicing, Dancing, Plays, and Interludes* (Shakespeare Society ed., p. 166): "Ludouicus Vives, a learned man, sayth: Loue is bred by reason of company, and communication with men; for among pleasures, feastings, laughing, dauncing, and voluptuousnesse, is the kingdom of Venus and Cupid: and with these things folkes myndes be entised and snared, and especially the women, on whome pleasure hath sorest dominion."

P. 54 (II, 51). "Like Aesop's cock, this jewel he enjoyed, And as a brother with his sister toyed." Similar allusions to the cock that preferred a barley-corn to a jewel were fairly common in Elizabethan times. See *E. P. L.*, p. 68. Further instances of the proverb are found in *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad*, III, iii (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, IX, 62); and *The Muse's Looking Glass*, II, iv, and III, ii (ed. Hazlitt, I, 213 and 224). This thought does not seem to have been included in English collections of proverbs until the time of Fuller (1732), who has it in the form, "A barley-corn is better than a diamond to a cock." It is not cited by Apperson.

M. P. TILLEY and JAMES K. RAY

*University of Michigan*

## SYMMETRY IN MILTON'S *SAMSON AGONISTES*

It is characteristic of the Greek tragedians that symmetry should not be confined to the general conception of a play. Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides were fellow-countrymen, perhaps contemporaries, of Phidias and Ictinus. And the Attic passion for beauty was expressed in the smallest details of any work of art. Thus, structural symmetry, in the great dramas, may be found

through every portion of the work, revealing itself in a constant balancing of part against part, and a formal correspondence of speech with speech, to which there is no parallel in any production of the modern stage.<sup>1</sup>

This particular debt of *Samson Agonistes* to Greek drama has

<sup>1</sup> A. E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, p. 378.

never been adequately investigated. But once we consider the matter, we find that here, as in so many other respects, Milton has successfully followed his best Greek models. He could scarcely have achieved more symmetry in his plot if he had planned it mathematically. It falls into five distinct parts, each an artistic whole, and all of very nearly the same length:<sup>2</sup>

- 1) Samson alone and with the Chorus: 1-325.
- 2) Samson and Manoa: 326-709.
- 3) Samson and Dalila: 710-1060.
- 4) Samson with the two instruments of force: 1061-1440.
- 5) Samson at the feast: 1441-1758.

It is also worth noticing that the first and last *epeisodia* are the shortest, being within ten lines of the same length;<sup>3</sup> and the *kommos*, upon which the play ends, is very nearly the length of the *prologos*.<sup>4</sup> If these points seem far-fetched, let it be recalled that

the artistic sense of the Greeks prevented them from pushing this principle to extremes, or from effacing the beauty and spontaneity of their drama by mathematical regularity of form. . . . Their occasional observance, without forcing itself unduly upon the attention, merely serves to impress the mind with a general sense of harmony and proportion.<sup>5</sup>

Milton, to be sure, has chosen to ignore the most obvious manifestation of this principle, the antistrophic arrangement of the choral odes. But when we look closely at the dialogue, or even at the choral odes themselves, we find that he has understood and subtly applied a typical attribute of Greek tragedy. How conscious the application was, we can only guess. Much of what we shall examine as evidence may be either pure coincidence or unconscious art. But the effect is there—and the effect is interesting.

The *prologos* of *Samson Agonistes* falls logically into five parts: eleven lines addressed to the guide; eleven lines explaining the occasion (12-22); forty-three and a half lines of lament for the past (23-66); an exactly equal number devoted to his present blindness (66-109); and five lines upon the approach of the

<sup>2</sup> If *S. A.* were divided into five equal parts, each would consist of 352 lines. As it happens, no one of the five parts here outlined misses this number by more than 34 lines. The Dalila episode comes within a single line of conforming exactly.

<sup>3</sup> *S. A.* 176-292, 1300-1426.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, 1-114, 1660-1758.

<sup>5</sup> Haigh, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

Chorus (110-114). The *parodos* does not admit of quite so striking a division. The first nine and a half lines are devoted to recognition and description (115-124). But then follow twenty-six and a half lines in which Samson's past glory is recalled (124-150), and twenty-five lines of lamentation (151-175). In the first *episodion*, however, there is only one noticeable instance of balance: the first two speeches of the Chorus are of exactly nine lines each (178-186, 210-218). The first *stasimon* is divided into five stanzas: three of these are seven lines long; one is eight, which is close enough; and the last is four. This last stanza, which might seem to destroy the symmetry, is exactly complemented by the following four lines announcing the arrival of Manoa (322-325, 326-329),<sup>6</sup> and the two stanzas together make another unit of eight lines.

In the second *episodion* there is much balancing of speeches. The two lines spoken by Samson on hearing of his father's approach (330-331) are matched by the two of the Chorus showing Samson to Manoa (338-339). When Manoa in fifteen lines tells how he is arranging for ransom (472-486), Samson protests in a speech of fifteen lines (487-501). The two speeches which immediately follow are nineteen and twenty lines, respectively (502-520, 521-540). Then the Chorus sings of temperance in six lines (541-546), Samson replies in six lines (547-552), and the Chorus adds a final word in five lines (553-557). The other speeches of this *episodion* exhibit no striking symmetry; Samson's and Manoa's final exchange are nine and seven lines respectively (590-598, 599-605). The second *stasimon*, however, is extremely interesting. It is divided into four sections. The second and third stanzas, of twenty and eighteen lines respectively (667-686, 687-704), consist of general philosophizing. The fourth stanza, a five-line prayer for Samson, seems to stand alone.<sup>7</sup> The first stanza, of fifteen lines (652-666), is exactly complemented by the fifteen-line speech announcing the arrival of Dalila (710-724)—almost a continuation of the ode.

In the third *episodion*, Dalila's first speech, of sixteen lines (732-747), is balanced by Samson's response of eighteen lines

<sup>6</sup> This structural symmetry in the choral odes is not inconsistent with Milton's statements in his preface. He explains that since the odes are not to be sung, he has not attempted to make them *metrically* alike. He says nothing about the length of his stanzas.

<sup>7</sup> However, see *S. A.* 726-731. This would give the interesting pattern: ABBAC.

(748-765). The next four speeches are of dissimilar length; but when Dalila rebukes Samson in two lines, his sarcastic reply is of exactly the same length (903-906). Dalila's final plea of twenty-one lines (907-927) is almost matched by Samson's refusal, which is two lines longer (928-950). These instances of symmetry are the more remarkable in this scene because Milton chivalrously allows Dalila about fifty more lines than he gives his hero. After Dalila's departure, we find an interesting 'pattern' furnished by the protagonist and the Chorus: the last four speeches consisting of two, four, five, and two lines respectively (997-1009). The third *stasimon* is made up of five stanzas (1010-1060). The first and last are eight lines long; the second is as long as their sum; and the fourth is seven—near enough to give the effect of balance. The middle stanza is twelve lines long—half-way between eight and sixteen.

The only perfect instance of balance in the actual dialogue between Samson and Harapha is the two-line challenge with its correspondingly brief reply (1104-1107). There is at least one example, however, of a pair of speeches which differ in length by only two lines (1156-1167, 1168-1177). Immediately after Harapha's departure there are two speeches by the Chorus and one by Samson, each of three lines (1244-1252). The fourth *stasimon* also displays a certain symmetry: the first stanza is of nineteen lines (1268-1286); the second, of ten—or almost half (1287-1296). The first stanza, incidentally, consists of only two sentences, which suggest a further division into parts of nine and ten lines respectively. The subsequent speech of the Chorus, eleven lines announcing the arrival of the Public Officer, completes the pattern.

In the fifth *epeisodion* the Officer has a speech of one line; Samson, one of ten; the Officer, another one; and Samson, a nine (1322-1342). Samson's final speech of the play, one of fourteen lines, is exactly balanced by the fifth *stasimon* (1413-1426, 1427-1440). In the final dialogue between Manoa and the Chorus, there are three successive speeches of two lines each (1515-1520). The *kommos* also has the symmetry which by now we should expect. The first outburst of the Chorus (1660-1668) is exactly half as long as the first semi-chorus (1669-1686). The second semi-chorus, as it happens, is three lines longer than the first; but the effect of symmetry is there. Manoa's last speech is only two lines

shorter than both semi-choruses combined. The final chorus, appropriately, stands alone.

A. W. Verity has rightly called attention to the comparative absence, in *Samson Agonistes*, of *στίχομυθία*, or conversation in alternate lines. This raises, however, a difficult point, which he does not attempt to deal with.<sup>8</sup> Milton must have been aware of the popularity of this device with the Greek tragedians; it is, moreover, another instance of their love of balance in dialogue. Euripides used it to the greatest extreme; in the *Ion* it monopolizes about one-fourth of the play.<sup>9</sup> The *Agamemnon* has less than any of the other extant tragedies, but both the *Prometheus* and the *Choephoroi* of Aeschylus have about twice as much as the *Agamemnon*. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, which *Samson Agonistes* so closely resembles in many respects, there is more *stichomythia* than in any of the other plays of Sophocles, and more than three times as much as in the *Agamemnon*. But the latter play, which is the only conceivable one to which Milton might have looked for precedent in this matter, has, in turn, at least three times as much as the *Samson*. In the English play there are only seven instances of this device, and no more than four single lines ever occur together.<sup>10</sup> As a matter of fact, there are only thirty-one single-line speeches in the entire play, and these include those speeches of Manoa and the Messenger which are really fractions of a line. It might be argued that the effect of *stichomythia* is given by combinations of two-line speeches<sup>11</sup> or by the combination of one-line with two- or three-line speeches.<sup>12</sup> But if we were to count all of these, it would no more than double the number of instances—and the *Samson* would still be deficient compared with any tragedy of the Greeks.

There are several possible reasons for the absence of *sticho-*

<sup>8</sup> Verity's edition of *S. A.*, p. xlvii n. But compare J. H. Hanford, who finds Milton's use of *stichomythia* 'reminiscent of the ancients' (*Handbook*, 1933 ed., p. 255). John Bailey makes the same generalization, *Milton*, p. 242.

<sup>9</sup> See also the *Hel.*, *Orest.*, and *Iph. Taur.*

<sup>10</sup> *S. A.* 1061-1064, 1074-1075, 1308-1309, 1345-1347, 1562-1563, 1569-1570, 1582-1584.

<sup>11</sup> For example, *ib.*, 903-906, 1104-1107, 1515-1520.

<sup>12</sup> For example, *ib.*, 1178-1181, 1233-1236, 1319-1322, 1363-1368, 1531-1536, 1552-1564.

*mythia* in Milton's play. He introduces it, as the Greeks do, when there is considerable tension; but on the whole, there is perhaps not enough emotional excitement in *Samson Agonistes* to allow of much of it. This, however, is only a partial answer; Euripides would have filled both the Harapha and Dalila scenes with 'thrust and parry in bright monostich.' Milton may conceivably have felt that large sections of this device mar rather than augment the symmetry of the piece; but more probably the true reason for his decision is to be found in a statement from his preface: having occasion to speak of the stage, he adds, significantly, 'to which this work never was intended.' *Stichomythia* is obviously a stage device: it delights both actors and audiences. In *Comus*, which Milton wrote for acting purposes, there is one instance fourteen lines long; nothing in the *Samson* can compare with this.<sup>13</sup> In his preface Milton carefully explains that he has ignored strophe, antistrophe, and epode because his choruses are not to be sung; he has also omitted division into act and scene, these being likewise for stage production. Naturally he would not mention *stichomythia* in this connection—it is too trivial a detail. But I suggest that its omission from the play may be similarly accounted for.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

Oriel College, Oxford

---

#### AUTHOR'S CHANGES IN DRYDEN'S *CONQUEST OF GRANADA*, PART I

The question of Dryden's relation to the various editions of his plays which appeared in successive quartos during his lifetime has long challenged critical attention. As early as 1800, Edmond Malone, in the extensive "Account of the Life and Writings of John Dryden" which prefaces his edition of Dryden's *Prose Works*, reached this general conclusion: "When Dryden issued his several works from the press, he in general seems to have dismissed them from his thoughts, and to have been little solicitous about

<sup>13</sup> *Comus*, 277-290. In the whole masque, however, there are only three instances of the device, probably because Milton was more interested in the lyrical element. And almost every Greek tragedy has a passage of *stichomythia* longer than the one in *Comus*.



rendering them more perfect." He noted, however, "several exceptions" to Dryden's "general negligence" in matters of revision. In considering Dryden's plays, he observed that "the second edition of his *Tyrannick Love* is said in the title-page to have been reviewed by the author." He further cited the preface to the second edition of *The Indian Emperor* as proof of some heed on Dryden's part to minor betterments of text, notwithstanding the author's confessed lack of leisure to amend "the more material faults of writing." On the main question of Dryden's "general negligence" in regard to revision of plays already published, Malone's conclusion seems substantially sound. To the "several exceptions" which may be said to prove Dryden's general rule, as interpreted by Malone, may be added a case of especial interest since it reveals alterations in Dryden's chief heroic drama, *The Conquest of Granada*.

The present study is based on collation of Yale Library copies of the five quartos of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, which appeared in Dryden's lifetime—1672 (Q1), 1673 (Q2), 1678 (Q3), 1687 (Q4), 1695 (Q5). The dominant authority of Q1 and the main relations to it of the successive quartos were firmly established in the valuable critical edition of *Selected Dramas of John Dryden* (1910), by Professor George R. Noyes. His general method of collating Dryden's texts was first to collate the considerably modernized Scott-Saintsbury edition "with the first edition of each play, and next with the Folio [published in 1701, the year after Dryden's death, and based on the inferior Q5], and a record was made of all variants. Then these variants were compared with the readings of the quartos (in which form Dryden's separate plays were always printed) intermediate between the first quarto and the Folio." In the case of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, this process led to the sound generalization that in Q2 "Dryden seems to have made some trifling changes, which disappeared in the later quartos." To Professor Noyes, "it did not seem worth while, however, to collate each line of the second quarto, in order to present a complete list of such changes." Nevertheless, full collation of Q2 with Q1 proves distinctly rewarding not merely in defining precisely the extent and character of these early "trifling changes" of text, but in providing a firmer basis for study of later textual history.

At the outset, it may be well to differentiate the so-called "author's changes" in Q2 from mere printer's corrections. Q1 shows some signs of hasty or careless printing in faulty pagination, in verbal misprints in the main text, and in the belated inclusion, after the Epilogue, of a song marked, "*Misplac'd. Sung at the dance, or Zambra in the third Act.*" Q2 transfers the misplaced song to its proper context and corrects some, though not all, of the misprints. In marked distinction from such merely mechanical corrections of details, four passages of the main text of Act V are revealed, through full collation of the quartos, as of outstanding significance. In all four cases, Q2 makes alterations that seem clearly beyond the province of the printer. If not, in the strictest sense of the term, author's changes, they suggest at least the sanction of authority above that of the compositor. These four passages will be considered first separately, then collectively.

- (1) Q1 *Benz.* No, *Ozmyn*, no, it is much less ill  
To leave me than dispute a Fathers will:  
(V, 2, 67-68)

Q2 *Benz.* No, *Ozmyn*, no; 'tis not so great an ill  
To leave me, as dispute a Fathers Will:

The emendation of Q2 is evidently intended to remedy the metrical defect in the first line of Q1.

- (2) Q1 And, bending to the blast, all pale and dead,  
Hears from within, the wind sing round its head:  
(V, 3, 131-132)

Q2 Bends to the blast, all pale, and almost dead  
While the loud Wind sings round its drooping Head.

The emendation of Q2 is clearly an authorized revision of the entire couplet.

- (3) Q1 When all my joys are gone  
What cause can I for living longer, give,  
But a dull lazy habitude to live? (V, 3, 245-247)

Q2 eliminates the first short unrhymed line. This seems an intentional change rather than a compositor's error in dropping a line accidentally.

- (4) Q1 *Almah.* It was your fault that fire seiz'd all your brest,  
You should have blown up some, to save the rest.  
But tis, at worst, but so consum'd by fire  
As Cities are, that by their falls rise high'r.  
(V, 3, 269-272)

Q2 *Alma.* Your Heart's, at worst, but so consum'd by fire  
As Cities are, that by their falls rise high'r.

The emendation of Q2 is obviously designed to eliminate the opening couplet of Q1, for the consequent alteration of the following line shows that the couplet itself was not dropped accidentally by the compositor.

The subsequent history of these four passages in the later quartos and in the Folio of 1701 is remarkably consistent and enlightening. In all four cases Q3 follows Q2, but Q4 reverts to the original readings of Q1, and is in turn followed by Q5 and F. Thus these four author's changes—definite textual emendations, at any rate, authorized by some one other than the mere printer—are found only in Q2 and Q3, and disappear not merely from the later quartos but from the Folio. The method of partial collation in the Noyes edition showed textual variants in two of the four passages (the first and the last), but the other passages remain equally unnoted by Noyes and by Montague Summers in his recent critical edition of Dryden's *Dramatic Works*. Taken together, these four passages become doubly significant, for they establish Q2 as the only quarto which makes independent, even if slender, contribution to real revision of the original text, and they support conclusively inferences hitherto largely drawn from minor textual variants as to the interrelations of the successive quartos.

In default of explicit documentary evidence, it is perhaps only a reasonable assumption that Dryden personally inaugurated or explicitly sanctioned the four considerable textual revisions introduced in Q2 and retained in Q3. It is significant, however, that, of these four so-called "author's changes," the two which Noyes detected are, in his judgment, "certainly due to Dryden." A specific note (p. 438) on one of these passages runs thus: "Dryden seems to have been impressed by the absurdity of this couplet and to have canceled it in the second edition. It was restored in the third [*sic*] edition, whether by his wish or not it is hard to say." The restoration occurred in Q4, not in Q3, but if error as to the fact misled Noyes in this latter particular, it remains clear that he ascribed to Dryden the alteration made in Q2. Chance or convenience may have determined the ultimate reversion in Q4 to the text of Q1, instead of reprinting from Q3. Whether accidental or not, that reversion to the original text silently eliminated all four of the so-called "author's changes." If Dryden had been disturbed by their disappearance, he might have insisted on their

restoration in Q5, published five years before his death. But there is no evidence of such concern on his part, for Q5 resumes the easy practice of reprinting from the latest previous text. It is, however, needless to carry over bodily into the realm of mere conjecture facts that remain amply significant in the field of actual history. In any event, the so-called "author's changes" in Q2 prove that the history of the successive quartos of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, is more than a record of casual reprints of a popular play. The hand of a higher authority than the compositor is shown in the definite textual revisions that appear in Q2. The discovery of fuller internal evidence brings into clearer view facts somewhat obscured because they appear and disappear within the range of the lesser quartos that intervene between Dryden's original text and the first collected edition of his plays.

*Yale University*

GEORGE H. NETTLETON

#### DRYDEN'S LETTER OF ATTORNEY

In 1677, when John Dryden received an addition of £100 a year to his pension of £200, the payments on both pensions began to be irregular and portional, so that the poet's income actually decreased. Finding it expedient to commission George Ward<sup>1</sup> to collect his money and perhaps feeling that Ward would be a more importunate and successful solicitor than he had been,<sup>2</sup> Dryden

<sup>1</sup> George Ward is probably the Mr. Ward whose name appears in the *Caveat Book* and *Out Letters (General)* in connection with money due his Majesty, grants, and the collection of various rents. — *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1679-80. Preserved in the Public Record Office*, ed. Wm. A. Shaw, Vol. VI (London, 1913), pp. 31, 110, 298, 412-13. He may also be the George Ward, spoken of on March 7th, 1677 (N. S.), however, as *late* of the parish of St. Martins-in-the-Fields, who "assaulted a certain Ulick Mack-Elligott, and . . . then and there slew and murdered the said Ulick Mack-Elligott, by giving him with a rapier a mortal wound in the right part of his belly, of which wound the said Ulick Mack-Elligott then and there instantly died. . . . Acquitted of murder, but found 'Guilty' of manslaughter, George Ward pleaded his clergy effectually: 'cre' resp' usq' p'x' [crematio respectuatur usque proximam Gaolae Deliberacionem] the branding was deferred till the next Gaol Delivery." The assault took place on February 14th, see *Middlesex County Records*, ed. J. C. Jeaffreson (London, 1886-92), IV, 76.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Vindication of the Duke of Guise* (1684) in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Walter Scott (London, 1808), VII, 163: "If I am a

drew up a power of attorney on December 14th, 1680. The sub-joined document, which is endorsed "Mr. Drydens Letter of Attorney to Mr. Ward 14<sup>th</sup>: xber 1680," is now in the Watson Autograph Collection (no. 583), National Library of Scotland.

Know all men by these presents that I John Dryden of the parish of St Martin in the feilds in the County of Middx<sup>s</sup> Esqr. have made ordeyned constituted and appoynted and in my stead and place putt George Ward of the same Parish and County Gentl<sup>n</sup> my true and lawfull Attorney for mee and in my name and to my use to aske require and receive of the officers and Tellers of his Majtyes Receipt of Excheqr all and every such sume and sumes of money as from tyme to tyme or att any tyme hereafter shall be due or payable to mee by vertue of his Majtyes Letters Patents and Privy Seale Granting to me the severall Pensons or Anuities of twoe hundred pounds and one hundred pounds yearly out of the said Receipt of Excheqr and the receipt acquittante or acquittances of the said George Ward either in my name or his owne shall be from tyme to tyme a sufficient warrt and discharge to such officer or Teller soe paying the same or any parte thereof by vertue hereof. Given under my hand and seale this foureteenth day of December Anno R Rs Caroli Sedi xxxijo Annoque dni 1680<sup>4</sup>

Sealed and delivered

in presence of

John Dryden

Margrat Rigby

the marke of

Barbara X<sup>s</sup> Humphres

John Bland

COLEMAN O. PARSONS

*American University*

mercenary scribbler, the lords commissioners of the treasury best know: I am sure, they have found me no importunate solicitor; for I know myself, I deserved little, and, therefore, have never desired much." It is likely that Dryden gave Ward power of attorney because of an intention to absent himself from London.

<sup>3</sup> Scott refers to Dryden as living in Gerrard Street about this time, but that street was not built until 1681. Although Mr. George H. Cunningham states that Dryden was living on the south side of Fleet Street (p. 238) and also at no. 137, Long Acre (p. 427), in 1680, the latter assertion is obviously the correct one.—Cunningham, *London* (London, 1927); see W. H. Davenport Adams, *A Book about London* (London, 1890), pp. 113, 149, for a similar contradiction.

<sup>4</sup> Two days after this date, on December 16th, 1680, the sum of £50 was issued to John Dryden. For a discussion of Dryden's pensions, see E. K. Broadus, *The Laureateship* (Oxford, 1921), pp. 59-74, and the more detailed and accurate treatment by C. E. Ward, "A Biographical Note on John Dryden," *MLR.*, xxvii (1932), 206-210, and L. I. Bredvold, "Notes on John Dryden's Pension," *MP.*, xxx (1933), 267-74.

<sup>5</sup> The X represents Barbara's mark.

## A DRYDEN ANECDOTE

In Defoe's *Review* for May 17, 1712 (VIII, no. 180), there appears the following story:

. . . meer calling Names, meer Railing, calling Fool, Beggar, Knave, that is, in *English*, *Rogue*, and *Rascal*; this was never suffer'd in any Age: I remember the Case of Mr. *Dryden*, the Author of *Absalom* and *Achitophel*; Mr. *Dryden* had describ'd the Duke of *Buckingham* with a great deal of Wit, but in one Line had given him ill Names, as *Fiddler* and *Buffoon*; the Duke was a Lover of Wit, and had as much himself as most Men of the Age, but resolved to take some Advantage of the Author's Weakness in that part; to which purpose, his Grace finds him at a *Coffee-House*, and charging him with want of Decency, as no true part of *Satyr*, Can'd him very smartly; there, *Sir*, said the Duke, is for your ill Manners; and here, *Sir*, says he, is for your Wit, and threw him a Purse with Thirty Guineas at the same Time. Now I would recommend to all those Gentlemen who take upon them to write Satyrs on Great Men, that they would take care to merit the Guineas without the Cane. . . .

Defoe was probably the first to print this story. In *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1898 (CLXXXVII, 101), an anonymous reviewer relates it "according to Lord Bathurst," probably Pope's Bathurst, Allen, the first Earl (1684-1775). Lady Winifred Burghclere in her biography, *George Villiers* (1903), tells it (p. 261), as does Mr. Robert P. Tristram Coffin in his book, *The Dukes of Buckingham* (1931, p. 328).

The anecdote can hardly be true; at any rate not in the exact way Defoe tells it. It may, of course, be nothing more than a variation on the "Black Will with a cudgel" episode, but if it is, it introduces elements into that story in a way rather difficult to explain. In *Athenae Oxonienses* Anthony à Wood, after quoting the portrait of Zimri, refers to the same anecdote Defoe tells:

Now whereas the generality of people think that Mr. Dryden was bastinado'd at Will's coffee-house in Covent-Garden for the said character, by the endeavours of the duke, is false . . . sure I am that the duke of Bucks did not cause him to be beaten. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Except for this reference the anecdote seems to be unknown to Dryden biography.

EDWARD G. FLETCHER

*The University of Texas*

<sup>1</sup> Philip Bliss' edition, London, 1820, iv, column 210.

## THE MODENA TROUPE IN ENGLAND

In his *Restoration Drama*, Professor Allardyce Nicoll traces four visits to England by troupes of Italian *commedia dell' arte* players. These occurred in 1673, 1675, 1678-79, and 1683, and in each case the troupe is identified as the one located in Paris from 1661 to 1697, including as its most famous actor Tiberio Fiorilli.<sup>1</sup> In a later work, however, Professor Nicoll alters his conclusion concerning the identification of the 1678-79 troupe:

It was in this year [1678] that the Duke of Modena was aiding in the arrangements for dispatching a company of Italian players to England. These were captained by Tiberio Fiorilli *Scaramuccia*, who had already been in London in 1673 and 1675, but included members of the Ducal troupe.<sup>2</sup>

It is my purpose in this paper to present additional information concerning the appearance of the Modena troupe in England, and to show that on this occasion Fiorilli was not a member of the company.

Professor Nicoll's identification of the Modena troupe is based upon information concerning Giovan Antonio Lolli and Antonio Riccoboni, members of the Modena troupe, to be found in Rasi's *I Comici Italiani*.<sup>3</sup> A complete list of the players who visited England in 1678 exists, however, in a hitherto unpublished document in the Public Record Office.<sup>4</sup> The "annexed list" of players contains thirty-six names. Twelve are those of actors of the times known to have been members of the Modena troupe. Of the remaining twenty-four, some represent wives and children of the actors, while others convey no hint of their relationship to the company. The known facts about the lives of the twelve actors are to be found in Rasi's work, by means of which the following troupe may be formed:

<sup>1</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, pp. 238-239. The same identification is made by Eleanore Boswell, *The Restoration Court Stage*, pp. 118-125, and Montague Summers, *The Complete Works of William Wycherley*, I, 263.

<sup>2</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *Masks Mimes and Miracles*, p. 339.

<sup>3</sup> Luigi Rasi, *I Comici Italiani* (Florence, 1897-1905), III, 31-32, 347.

<sup>4</sup> February 13, 1679. Pass for the band of Italian Players, now departing out of this realm, with annexed list of them sent by Lord Arlington. *Cal. State Papers, Dom. Ser.*, 1679-1680, p. 83.

Antonio Riccoboni	<i>Pantalone</i>
Giuseppe Tortoriti	<i>Pasquariello</i>
Giuseppe Antonio Fiala	<i>Capitano Sbranalearoni</i>
Marzia Fiala	<i>Flaminia (seconda donna)</i>
Giovan Antonio Lolli	<i>Dottor Brentino</i>
Francesco Angeli <sup>5</sup>	? ( <i>amoroso</i> )
Gio. Andrea Cimadori	<i>Finocchio (zanni)</i>
Bernardo Narici	<i>Orazio (amoroso)</i>
Costantino Costantini	<i>Gradelino (zanni)</i>
Domenica Costantini	<i>Corallina (servetta)</i>
Giovanni Battista Costantini	<i>Cintio (amoroso)</i>
Teresa Corona Sabolini Costantini	<i>Diana (prima donna)</i>

The name of Tiberio Fiorilli does not appear, and to date no proof of his presence in England at this time has been produced.

Unlike the Paris troupe, which on its three appearances in England played during the summer months, the Modena troupe came in November.<sup>6</sup> There is extant a letter written by Lolli from England in which it is revealed that the Italians were not happy at the court of Charles II.<sup>7</sup> They remained three months, yet were able to present only six plays "con Pochissimo Applauso." Just why they were unsuccessful is not clear. The actors themselves were excellent, although there was dissension in their ranks as Lolli's letter indicates. The letter does, however, explain the presence of the Duke of Modena's company in England. Lolli praises "Sua Altezza Reale là Sig.<sup>ra</sup> Duchessa di Iorch" as the benefactor of the troupe. This was Mary d'Este, daughter of Alfonso IV, Duke of Modena, and second wife of James, Duke of York. It was undoubtedly at Mary of Modena's instigation that the troupe of the Duke, at that time her brother, Francesco II, journeyed to England. And when the Italian players were unsuccessful, she aided them twice with money, and finally secured for them the "tanto desiderata licenza" to leave England. One of her letters to her brother, the Duke of Modena, furnishes a possible explanation for the Italians' failure in England: the ill-feeling and unrest at court caused by the charges of Titus Oates.<sup>8</sup> The position of

<sup>5</sup> Probably Francesco Delli Angioli, known to have been a member of the Modena troupe in 1679 (See Rasi, *op. cit.*, I, 751-752).

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Treasury Books*, 1676-79, p. 1160.

<sup>7</sup> Rasi, *op. cit.*, III, 31.

<sup>8</sup> Martin Haile, *Queen Mary of Modena* (London, 1905), p. 79.



the Duchess, a Catholic, at the English court during a time of strong anti-Catholic sentiment was a difficult one, and the disfavor in which she was held may have extended to her Italian compatriots.

This first recorded visit of the troupe of the Duke of Modena to England seems also to have been the last. Tiberio Fiorilli, who cannot be connected with the Modena troupe, is thought to have made a final appearance at the court of Charles II in 1683, bringing with him the regular Paris troupe.<sup>9</sup> On this point, however, there is no positive proof.

A. L. BADER

Ann Arbor, Michigan

### LA MARQUISE DU BOURGEOIS GENTILHOMME

Je voudrais dans cet article réhabiliter une femme : la charmante Dorimène du *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, qui a été si fort malmenée par les critiques. Il est même surprenant de constater avec quelle unanimité ils s'acharnent sur cette jeune veuve, et combien ce rôle si secondaire a attiré l'attention malveillante des commentateurs.

Il me sera nécessaire de faire un assez grand nombre de citations pour montrer l'étendue et le sérieux de l'attaque. Je commencerai par les plus furieuses et les plus étonnantes : Lafenestre dans son petit volume très modéré sur Molière dans la "Collection des Grands Ecrivains français" ira jusqu'à dire :

Mme de Sotenville et Mme d'Escarbagnas ne sont que des sottises ridicules, affolées de vanité nobiliaire, mais Angélique, née de Sotenville, et la marquise Dorimène qui *enjôle* M. Jourdain, comme son homonyme avait déjà épousé de force Sganarelle, ne sont que d'affreuses drôlesses, libertines et rapaces.<sup>1</sup>

Ailleurs il dira : "D'autre part, la Noblesse, cultivée mais corrompue, avec ses insolences et ses vices, dans la *comtesse intrigante* et son *digne* amant, le comte escroc."<sup>2</sup> Dorimène est associée ici, comme elle le sera toujours, avec Dorante. J'abandonne Dorante aux critiques, mais je souligne le mot "digne amant," et je m'étonne moins de l'erreur sur le caractère de ma marquise quand

<sup>9</sup> Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, p. 239, and Boswell, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-125.

<sup>1</sup> Georges Lafenestre: *Molière*, 1909, p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82.

je vois l'auteur parler d'*enjôler* M. Jourdain, et la marquise devenir une *comtesse*. C'est un désappointement pour moi de m'apercevoir que Lintilhac, si pondéré et si bon juge, n'est pas plus indulgent: "*Le couple d'aventuriers de haut vol* que forment le comte Dorante et la marquise Dorimène."<sup>3</sup>

Je passe à un second groupe de critiques qui sont moins sévères, et par là même plus dangereuses, parce que plus acceptables au premier abord. Je citerai par exemple Brisson:

Dorimène paraît étrangère à ces manèges; pourtant on ne peut guère concevoir qu'une aussi fine *commère* ne remarque pas dans ce qui se passe autour d'elle un je ne sais quoi d'équivoque et de suspect. De la *sucrée* et *sournoise* Dorimène, de l'effronté Dorante, naîtra l'innombrable lignée des fripons du grand monde, des *louches coquettes* qui pendant un siècle et demi pulluleront au théâtre.<sup>4</sup>

L'édition Despois-Mesnard résume et consacre . . . l'erreur:

Il n'est pas *tout-à-fait exact* de dire, comme quelques-uns l'ont fait, que dans la comédie de *Turcaret* les figures du chevalier, qui a fait ses caravanes au lansquenet, et de la coquette baronne, aient été dessinées d'après celles de Dorante et *Dorimène*, lesquelles ont pu suggérer seulement l'idée de ces personnages, très différents d'ailleurs. En apparence le plus hardi des deux auteurs comiques a été Lesage, qui a donné des couleurs beaucoup plus noires à la corruption de son chevalier et de sa baronne; mais à y bien regarder, c'est Molière qui a le plus osé, justement parce qu'au lieu d'être de vulgaires aventuriers, son comte est un vrai comte, sa *marquise* une vraie marquise, l'un et l'autre, sans qu'il reste de doute, gens du monde et gens de cour.<sup>5</sup>

Oui, la marquise est une "vraie marquise," mais elle n'est pas une "aventurière."

Mais dans ce concert d'accusations<sup>6</sup> j'entends une autre note frappée par ceux qui ont lu la pièce avant d'en parler, et qui cherchent à être justes, mais qui n'osent pas aller contre l'opinion reçue, et dans leur embarras trouvent Dorimène "énigmatique." Je pense pour le moment à Rigal qui connaît son Molière, et qui,

<sup>3</sup> Eugène Lintilhac: *Histoire du Théâtre en France*, 1908, III, 278.

<sup>4</sup> Adolphe Brisson: *Le Théâtre*, 1912, VII, 233.

<sup>5</sup> *Œuvres de Molière*, Edition: Les Grands Ecrivains de la France, 1883, VIII, 36.

<sup>6</sup> Voir aussi: *Conférences faites aux matinées classiques du Théâtre National de l'Odéon*, 1894, I, 86, et Victor Fournel: *Les Contemporains de Molière*, 1866, II, 274.

après avoir dit : “ Dorimène est le personnage le plus énigmatique de tout le Théâtre de Molière,” ne la condamne pas moins un peu plus loin en ces mots : “ Cependant, gardons-nous de calomnier même une Dorimène. Celle-ci n’est pas aussi délibérément une *friponne* que sa fille ou sa petite-fille, la Baronne de Lesage.” <sup>7</sup>

Cette unanimité des critiques m’étonne sans m’ébranler, et je reste convaincu que la Marquise est irréprochable. Je voudrais pouvoir citer tout son rôle, qui n’est pas long, et faire ressortir toutes ses qualités d’honnêteté, de délicatesse, de finesse. Je me contenterai de ces quelques lignes qui exposent si clairement ses rapports avec Dorante :

Mais vous ne dites pas que je m’engage insensiblement chaque jour à recevoir de trop grands témoignages de votre passion. . . . Pour moi, je ne puis plus répondre de rien, et je crois qu’à la fin vous me ferez venir au mariage dont je me suis tant éloignée. . . . Enfin, j’en reviens toujours là. Les dépenses que je vous vois faire pour moi m’inquiètent par deux raisons : l’une, qu’elles m’engagent plus que je ne voudrais ; et l’autre, que je suis sûre, sans vous déplaire, que vous ne les faites point que vous ne vous incommodiez, et je ne veux point cela.<sup>8</sup>

Est-ce là une “ *affreuse drôlesse, libertine et rapace, une intrigante, une louche coquette* ? ” L’est-elle davantage quand elle s’étonne que le festin ait lieu chez Jourdain : “ Je ne sais pas, Dorante ; je fais encore ici une étrange démarche, de me laisser amener par vous dans une maison où je ne connais personne,” ou quand elle sort avec dignité après l’arrivée inattendue de Mme Jourdain : “ Que veut donc dire tout ceci ? Allez ! Dorante, vous vous moquez de m’exposer aux sottes visions de cette extravagante,” ou quand elle se moque de M. Jourdain en grande dame qu’elle est, quand il s’excuse auprès d’elle de la conduite de sa femme : “ Cela n’est rien ; j’excuse en elle un pareil mouvement. Votre cœur lui doit être précieux ; et il n’est pas étrange que la possession d’un homme comme vous puisse inspirer quelques alarmes.” J’ai beau relire le rôle, je ne trouve rien, je l’avoue, qui justifie ces accusations, je ne trouve pas un mot, une intention, une nuance, qui puisse donner au juge le plus malveillant l’impression que le personnage de Molière est autre qu’une femme qui non seulement n’a rien d’énigmatique, mais qui est la personnification même de l’honnêteté et de la délicatesse. Je dirai plus : du moment que la marquise n’est

<sup>7</sup> Eugène Rigal : *Molière*, 1908, II, 213.

<sup>8</sup> *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, III, 18.

pas une "affreuse drôlesse," et qu'elle n'est pas "complice" de Dorante, et je crois vraiment que la lecture du rôle même le prouve, il *faut*, du point de vue de la pièce même, qu'elle soit foncièrement honnête. Pourquoi? Voici: Nous n'avons pas affaire ici avec un couple d'aventuriers, nous avons un jeune homme sans argent qui veut épouser une marquise, probablement bien rentée, et c'est pour la conquérir qu'il exploite Jourdain. Il faut donc que la marquise soit honnête, car, si elle ne l'était pas, elle soupçonnerait la combinaison: il pourrait lui venir à l'idée que le diamant, par exemple, vient de Jourdain et non pas du comte. Elle est peut-être un peu naïve, mais cela ajoute encore à son honnêteté. Dorante et Molière l'ont donc choisie vertueuse exprès pour qu'elle ne soupçonne rien.

Suis-je donc seul en face de la critique? La situation serait embarrassante. Heureusement je trouve un critique, un seul qui me justifie complètement, et c'est un homme à qui on reconnaît quelque bon sens: Francisque Sarcey écrit dans un feuilleton:

Dorimène doit être, à ce qu'il me semble, une jeune veuve un peu légère[?], sans doute, mais honnête, mais spirituelle, qui voit la meilleure compagnie et qui est très digne d'être reçue par elle. Elle ne sait rien des turpitudes de ce Dorante qui lui fait la cour, elle accepte ses dîners et ses cadeaux sans se douter qu'un autre les paie; elle rit du bourgeois gentilhomme sans soupçonner que le plus clair de sa fortune vient de lui[?]; elle ne songe qu'au mariage, qui raccommode toute chose. Elle ne doit exciter ni commisération ni mépris, ni haine: c'est une jolie, jeune personne qui marche gentiment sur un pavé crotté, sans y salir le bord de sa bottine. C'est la Dorimène de Molière, telle qu'il l'a vue et représentée sur la scène.<sup>9</sup>

Si Sarcey a déjà dit cela en 1862, pourquoi crois-je nécessaire de le répéter? Parce que, si le passage que je viens de citer est très net, il est entouré d'un commentaire qui l'obscurcit: Sarcey commence en effet ce paragraphe par ces mots: "Il y a *deux* façons d'interpréter le rôle de la marquise," et il ajoute sitôt après le passage cité:

*Mais* on peut encore prendre ce rôle d'une autre façon. Dorimène *peut fort bien* être une coquette sur le retour. . . . Je ne crois pas, à parler franc, que ce soit là le vrai sens du rôle, mais l'interprétation une fois admise il faut avouer que l'actrice qui en était chargée l'a joué avec beaucoup de naturel. Molière ne se serait pas reconnu mais il eût applaudi.

---

<sup>9</sup> Francisque Sarcey: *Quarante ans de Théâtre*, 1885, II, 174.

C'est probablement à cause de ces quelques contradictions que cet article n'a en réalité produit aucune impression : tous les passages cités plus haut condamnant la marquise sont en effet postérieurs à cet article. Sarcey lui-même ne semble pas très convaincu puisqu'il cite ailleurs<sup>10</sup> sans aucun commentaire ces lignes de Théodore Reinach : "Quand Molière met en scène des *coquins* de cette sorte, Dorante et *Dorimène* du *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, *Tartuffe*, il se garde bien de leur témoigner sa sympathie et il les met dehors au dernier acte." Dorimène associée maintenant avec Tartuffe !

D'où vient cette méconnaissance persistante du vrai caractère de Dorimène ? J'en vois trois explications possibles : La première est suggérée par l'article même de Sarcey : les actrices semblent donner à Dorimène ce caractère généralement accepté. La raison en paraît assez évidente : il n'existe pour le rôle de Dorimène aucune tradition écrite ; mais, comme me l'écrit le Régisseur Général de la Comédie Française, "la marquise appartient à l'emploi des Coquettes,<sup>11</sup> et bien que le rôle soit secondaire il est toujours joué par la première coquette. Son importance, pour relative qu'elle soit, étant cependant très grande pour l'équilibre de la pièce de Molière." Quoi de plus naturel pour la "première coquette" que de forcer un peu le rôle, le rapprocher de son emploi, et ne pas insister particulièrement sur ce qu'il a de naïf et d'honnête ?

La seconde explication est en germe dans le nom même de notre héroïne, qui a très bien pu provoquer la confusion : nous trouvons dans l'édition Despois-Mesnard :

Il semble qu'en 1645 il [le nom Dorimène] servait à désigner de vraies courtisanes. . . . On se rappelle que Molière, dans le *Mariage Forcé*, a donné ce même nom à la "coquette achevée" qui mène Sganarelle à ses fins. Il a voulu sans doute, en le choisissant pour la marquise que M. Jourdain a faite et déclare dame de ses pensées, attacher tout d'abord au personnage une idée de galanterie et d'aventure.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 245.

<sup>11</sup> La raison pourrait bien en être que le rôle a probablement été créé par Mlle de Brie (*Œuvres de Molière*. Edition : Les Grands Ecrivains de la France, 1883, VIII, 27), qui jouait les coquettes et les précieuses, mais je me plais à remarquer qu'elle jouait aussi la femme de Sganarelle qui n'est pas précisément une coquette, et dans le *Mariage Forcé* elle joue "une Egyptienne" tandis que c'est la Duparc qui joue Dorimène "jeune coquette."

<sup>12</sup> *Œuvres de Molière*. Edition : Les Grands Ecrivains de la France, 1883, VIII, 43.

Mais l'auteur de la note se contredit immédiatement quand il dit: "Dorimène avait été au théâtre un simple nom d'amoureuse; il l'est par exemple dans les *Vendanges de Suresnes*, comédie de du Ryer (1635)." Donc le nom même n'implique en aucune façon "le caractère de galanterie et d'aventure." Le malheur veut que ce nom ait été repris plus tard par Dancourt et par Lesage, pour des rôles insignifiants sans doute, mais dans un monde bien différent de celui qui entoure le Bourgeois, et que cette association ait confirmé de plus en plus la mauvaise réputation du nom même de Dorimène.<sup>13</sup>

Et ceci nous amène à la troisième explication, plus plausible encore, du discrédit dans lequel est tombée ma marquise, et qui s'offre d'elle-même dans toutes les citations ci-dessus: c'est-à-dire la confusion qui s'est faite dans l'esprit des critiques entre ce personnage de Molière et certains personnages de Lesage par exemple. Rappelons-nous en effet que ce nom de Dorimène n'est qu'une des nombreuses ressemblances, et certainement la moins importante, entre *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* et *Turcaret*, qui est bourré de souvenirs de la pièce de Molière: Turcaret est amoureux de la baronne, il lui écrit un billet dont on se moque, il lui offre un banquet accompagné de chants, il lui donne une bague, il voudrait qu'une trompette accompagne le chant. *Turcaret* semble souvent un écho du *Bourgeois*.<sup>14</sup> Quoi d'étonnant donc à ce que les critiques confondent dans leurs jugements aujourd'hui les personnages de ces deux pièces, et que, comme Dorante est, lui, une ébauche du chevalier de *Turcaret*, on soit amené à penser que son amie Dorimène correspond à la baronne qui gruge Turcaret?<sup>15</sup> Et cela est

<sup>13</sup> "Vous avez eu quelque démêlé de carrosse à carrosse avec une marquise qu'on nomme Dorimène." (Dancourt: *Le Chevalier à la mode*, III, 2.) Dans *Turcaret* Mme Jacob se présente "de la part de Mme Dorimène" et est reçue immédiatement. (Lesage: *Turcaret*, IV, 9.)

<sup>14</sup> "A la représentation de *Turcaret* la première impression des contemporains fut celle de quelque chose déjà vu: 'Mais c'est le *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*!', disait-on. Rappelez-vous la comédie de Molière: M. Jourdain se couvre de vêtements magnifiques, il fait la connaissance d'une marquise des plus aimables, Dorimène, Turcaret, lui aussi a une baronne. . . ." (*Conférences faites aux matinées classiques du Théâtre National de l'Odéon*, 1896, VII, 16, Conférence par G. Larroumet.)

<sup>15</sup> "Pour écrire une des comédies les plus fortes du siècle suivant, Lesage n'aura qu'à combiner ce Harpin (de la *Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*) avec le Dorante et la Dorimène du *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*." (Eugène Lintilhac: *Histoire du Théâtre en France*, 1908, III, 281.) Cette confusion entre les

si vrai qu'avant les critiques que j'ai cités, qui comparent toujours Dorimène avec les personnages de Lesage, on ne mentionne jamais la pauvre marquise, dont le rôle est en somme si secondaire. Les frères Parfaict par exemple citent tous les personnages du *Bourgeois*, sauf Dorimène.<sup>16</sup> Mais depuis le XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle elle a pris une importance nouvelle, et surtout elle se trouve identifiée avec la sinistre famille des personnages de Dancourt et Lesage. On l'appelle leur mère; elle est en vérité, la Dorimène des critiques, l'héritière infortunée de tous ces escrocs. Ceux-ci je ne les défendrai pas, pas plus que je n'ai eu la prétention de défendre Dorante, mais je déplore le fait que la pauvre marquise a été jetée en cette compagnie, et que les critiques se refusent à l'en délivrer.

RENÉ TALAMON

*University of Michigan*

#### SOBRE EL PASAJE DEL QUIJOTE REFERENTE AL TIRANT LO BLANCH

El artículo del Profesor H. H. Arnold<sup>1</sup> vuelve a poner en tela de juicio este famoso pasaje, tradicionalmente considerado "el más oscuro del *Quijote*."<sup>2</sup> De nada ha servido la nota—tan luminosa—de B. Sanvisenti;<sup>3</sup> de nada el magistral estudio de Américo Castro.<sup>4</sup>

personnages des deux pièces est si réelle que Hervier par exemple dira: "le chevalier Dorante" en parlant du Dorante de Molière. (M. Hervier: *Les Écrivains français jugés par leurs contemporains*, 1929, I, 386.)

<sup>16</sup> "Le sens droit de Madame Jourdain, la complaisance intéressée de Dorante, la gayeté ingénue de Nicole, le bon esprit de Lucile, la noble franchise de Cléonte, la subtilité féconde de Covielle; et la burlesque vanité des différents maîtres d'arts et de sciences, jettent encore un nouveau jour sur le caractère de M. Jourdain." (*Histoire du Théâtre Français* des Frères Parfaict, 1747, XI, 59.)

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Language Notes*, vol. L, 1935, págs. 182-185.

<sup>2</sup> Véase la historia del problema en Rodríguez Marín: *Don Quijote*, t. VII, 1928, apéndice, págs. 172-180.

<sup>3</sup> *RFE.*, t. IX, 1922, págs. 58-62.

<sup>4</sup> *El Pensamiento de Cervantes*, 1925. Véase especialmente la sección, *Armonía y disonancia*, págs. 20-23. En realidad la solución última de nuestro problema está tácitamente contenida en este libro de Castro aun cuando por razones de exposición el autor no se ocupara directamente del asunto.

Vislumbrábamos ya—en relación con la totalidad del pensamiento estético de Cervantes—cuál hubiera de ser el verdadero significado de su comentario crítico sobre el *Tirant lo blanch*, y se quiere ahora desandar el camino, para recaer, por vericuetos extraviados, en estériles interpretaciones filológicas.

La dificultad del pasaje—reléase una vez más—se debe a la aparente contradicción allí encerrada. Hace Cervantes un elogio (¿directo?, ¿irónico?) del *Tirant lo blanch*; a renglón seguido condena (¿directamente?, ¿irónicamente?), al autor que lo había compuesto. Fúndase el elogio: 1º., en que el libro es “un tesoro de contento y una mina de pasatiempos”; 2º., en que contiene personajes y ocurrencias tales como “don Quirieleisón de Montalbán, valeroso caballero . . . y las agudezas de la doncella Placerdemivida, con los amores y embustes de la viuda Reposada, etc.”; 3º., en que es un libro excepcional entre todos los de caballerías: “por su estilo, es éste el mejor libro del mundo: aquí comen los caballeros, y duermen y mueren en sus camas, y hacen testamento antes de su muerte, con otras cosas de que todos los demás libros deste género carecen.” Ahora bien, ¿en qué se basa Cervantes para condenar al autor? En que no escribió tales disparates de intento (“pues no hizo tantas necedades de industria”).

El sentido gramatical de todo el pasaje queda perfectamente claro, sin que falte ni sobre la menor cosa; la expresión *de industria* no puede constituir serio problema, pues bien conocido es su significado, *de intento*, *de propósito*, y con este valor aparece repetidas veces en Cervantes;<sup>5</sup> del término *necedades* poseemos un curiosísimo ejemplo cervantino que viene a confirmar este sentido especial de *disparate* o *extravagancia*.<sup>6</sup> ¿En qué consiste, pues, la

<sup>5</sup> “. . . salió a buscar luz, para buscar y prender los delinquentes; mas no la halló, porque el ventero, *de industria*, había muerto la lámpara. . . .” *Don Quijote*, I, 16 (RM I, 466, 4) Otros casos: *Don Quijote*, I, 9 (RM I, 296, 1); I, 27 (RM II, 358, 8); *El Celoso Extremeño*, Clás. Cast. pág. 122; *El Casamiento Engañoso*, Clás. Cast. pág. 180.

<sup>6</sup> “. . . póngame yo una por una en el Toboso, y delante de mi señora Dulcinea; que yo le diré tales cosas de las *necedades* y *locuras*, que *todo es uno*, que vuestra merced ha hecho y queda haciendo. . . .” I, 15 (RM II, 300, 3). Es enteramente gratuita la suposición de Rodríguez Marín: “obscenas bellaquerías o necedades, como eufemísticamente las llama el cura” (*loc. cit.*). Pensara lo que pensara de su señor, Sancho no hubiera calificado nunca a don Quijote de necio, obsceno o bellaco, sino más bien de loco, extravagante y fantástico.



dificultad? Sin duda, en desentrañar el contenido crítico de la contraposición, que no contradicción, entre alabanza y condena.

Nada tenemos que objetar a la interpretación—definitiva—de Sanvisenti. Nos hemos de limitar, por lo tanto, a una aducción de pruebas que corroboren y remachen la solución del hispanista italiano.<sup>7</sup>

Si bien se mira, el comentario de Cervantes sobre *Tirant lo blanch* no es otra cosa sino la aplicación a un caso particular, de aquel principio estético que informa todo el *Quijote*, y aun toda la obra cervantina: transposición a un plano irónico de aquello que ya se encuentra situado en un plano o bien de Arte, o bien de Experiencia. Y ese mismo concepto crítico que Cervantes expresa como de pasada y en forma excesivamente elíptica al comentar el *Tirant*, vuelve a surgir—esta vez con pleno significado teórico—en el siguiente pasaje del *Viaje del Parnaso*:<sup>8</sup>

¿Cómo puede agradar un desatino,  
sino es que de propósito se hace,  
mostrándole el donaire su camino?

*Desatino*, es decir, *necedades*; *de propósito*, es decir, *de industria*. Hasta aquí, idéntico pensamiento en ambos pasajes. Ahora, la introducción del tercer elemento, *donaire*, al completar el juicio, aclara súbitamente el sentido del comentario al *Tirant*, disipando su tenebrosa oscuridad. Cervantes condena al autor por haber escrito esos divertidos disparates llanamente, en pura ingenuidad y sin segunda intención irónica.

Y ciertamente nada de sorprendente puede ofrecer esta actitud crítica tan cervantina, tan esencialmente siglo XVI. Para el Renacimiento, la fantasmagoría ojival del mundo de caballerías es una rica cantera de material poético; pero material para ser recreado en nueva visión, con nuevo estilo: perspectiva y escorzo, intelectualización, motivación psicológica, ironía. Véase elaborando

<sup>7</sup> He aquí, en lo más esencial, la interpretación de Sanvisenti: “. . . ma l'autore del romanzo, che ebbe tante chicche di sale in testa de capire tutto questo e da tirar giù, per così dire, dal mondo della luna quei benedetti cavalieri e non capì, come avrebbe dovuto, che le tante solite *necedades* bisogna scriverle a bella posta, per farle deridere, per mostrare che lo son scempiaggini, che giudizio merita? Vada alla galera a vita, poichè tradì il suo buon senso e non capì quanto capì mirabilmente il Cervantes che ciò è *tante neceades* si può scriverli sì, ma *de industria*” (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>8</sup> Edic. Schevill-Bonilla, págs. 84-85.

la nueva forma caballeresca en el *Morgante*, *Orlando innamorato*, *Orlando furioso*, Gil Vicente—modalidad plateresca española—; culmina, finalmente, en el genial contrapunto del *Quijote*.

Cuando Cervantes vuelve los ojos hacia el *Tirant lo blanch* descubre allí ciertos asomos, destellos, anticipaciones de la nueva poética; todo ello, sin embargo, cosa inconsciente y por realizar. Y con un gesto de humorística severidad impone al autor—que no había sabido darse cuenta de tan maravillosas posibilidades—la pena de galeras perpetuas. ¿Qué menos? Por su delito de leso Arte bien merecidas las tenía.

AUGUSTO CENTENO

Princeton University

---

#### A NOTE ON DESPORTES AND DU BELLAY

Ariosto's Orlando, grieving over the perfidy of his sweetheart, is described as so full of sorrow that his emotion, like water held in a narrow-necked bottle, cannot force its way out, but remains choked within him (*O. F.* xxiii, 113). The simile is novel; Du Bellay, when he composed his mournful *Complainte du Desespéré* (*Œuvres de l'invention de l'auteur*, 1552) transposed it to the first person and made it a symbol of his own pent-up emotion.

Finding it again in a *Complainte* by Desportes (*Amours d'Hippolyte*, first pub., 1573) and noticing a certain thematic similarity between the two poems, I compared them, with interesting results. Du Bellay's *Complainte* is a long, rambling composition, inspired by the Book of Job, the gloomier portions of the *Æneid* and the *Odes* and *Epodes* of Horace, and, indubitably, the poet's private misfortunes. He begins with a prayer for sufficient strength to express his over-powering grief, to which he fears no means of portrayal are adequate. His youth knew some pleasures, but it is over; old age holds for him no prospect but the misery to which he was destined at birth. Innocent and harmless, he has been continually punished by men and by his adverse stars; he has found Justice to be a myth, blind Chance the real ruler of Earth and Heaven. And he resolves to prove by suicide whether the torments of the nether world are not preferable to those of ours.

Desportes's *Complainte* is much more brief. He omits the many historical examples and classical embellishments put in by Du

Bellay, but he tells the same tale and makes use of the same expressions; only, the ideas are arranged in a somewhat different order. Except for its first two stanzas, his *Complainte* is completely an imitation of passages in the *Complainte du Desespéré*:<sup>1</sup>

## COMPLAINTE

Quelle manie est égale à ma rage?  
 Quel mal se peut à mon mal comparer?  
 Je ne scauroy ny crier ny pleurer,  
 Pressé du deuil qui grossist mon courage.  
 Hélas! j'estouffe, et la fureur soudaine  
 Me clost l'ouye, et m'aveugle les yeux;  
 Mais ce m'est heur de ne voir plus les cieux,  
 Les cieux cruels, coupables de ma paine.  
 Au vase estroit maintenant je ressemble,  
 Qui, tout plein d'eau, goute à goute la rand;  
 Mon œil aussi larme à larme respand  
 Ce qu'en mon cœur de rivières j'assemble.  
 Maudit le jour que premier je vey luire,  
 Pour estre esclave à si forte douleur!  
 Le ciel alors pleuvant tout son malheur,  
 Versa sur moy ce qu'il avoit de pire.  
 Astres maudits, qui trop pleins de licence,  
 Maux et plaisirs aux humains destinez,  
 Puis qu'en naissant de nous vous ordonnez,  
 Que nuist la faute, ou que sert l'innocence?  
 Hélas! de rien! j'en puis servir de preuve,  
 Qui n'ay jamais un tourment mérité;  
 Et toutesfois par vostre cruauté  
 Plus miserable au monde ne se treuve.  
 Tout est bandé pour me faire la guerre,  
 Par mes amis mille ennuis je reçois;  
 Que doy-je faire? Il n'y a point pour moy  
 De dieux au ciel, ny de fortune en terre.  
 Dans les enfers cherchons donc allégeance,  
 Parmi l'effroy, les fureurs et les cris,  
 Accompagné des malheureux esprits,  
 Qui pour ma peine oublieront leur souffrance.  
 Hastons la mort, seul but du miserable;  
 Mais, tout ainsi que mes jours ont esté  
 Couverts d'ennuis, d'horreur, d'obscurité,  
 Soit mon trespas horrible et detestable.

<sup>1</sup> Du Bellay's lines are quoted from his *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. H. Chamard, Paris, Hachette, 1919, iv, 87-110 (Soc. des textes fr. mod.). Desportes's *Complainte* is found in his *Œuvres*, ed. A. Michiels, Paris, Delahays, 1858,

## LINES FROM THE 'COMPLAINTE DU DESESPERE'

Au vase estroict, qui degoute  
 Son eau, qui veult sortir toute,  
 Ores semblable je suis: (37-39)  
 Mauldicte donq' la lumiere  
 Qui m'esclaira la premiere,  
 Puy que le ciel rigoureux  
 Assujetit ma naissance  
 A l'indomtable puissance  
 D'ung astre si malheureux. (409-414)  
 Divine majesté haulte,  
 D'ou me viennent, sans ma faulte,  
 Tant de remors furieux?  
 O malheureuse innocence,  
 Sur qui ont tant de licence  
 Les astres injurieux! (469-474)  
 Las, pourquoy ne se retire  
 De moy ce cruel martyre,  
 Si mes innocentes mains,  
 Pures de sang & rapines,  
 Ne feurent onques inclines  
 A rompre les droictz humains? (421-426)  
 Si l'injure desrigrée  
 De la fortune aveuglée,  
 Si ung faulx bon-heur promis  
 Par les faveurs journalieres,  
 Si les fraudes familiares  
 De trop courtizans amis, . . . (97-102)  
 Il est temps de faire espreuve,  
 Si apres la mort on treuve  
 La fin de tant de malheurs. (489-492)

ALICE CAMERON

*Maryland College for Women*


---

“WES DAS HERZ VOLL IST, DES GEHET DER  
MUND ÜBER”

This verse, occurring in the first edition (1522) and all subsequent editions of Luther's New Testament, has since become a familiar quotation, cited as such by Büchmann.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Luther pp. 155-6. It is hardly necessary to add that his opening stanza is inspired by Lamentations, I, 12.

<sup>1</sup> *Geflügelte Worte. Der Zitatenschatz des deutschen Volkes gesammelt von Georg Büchmann, 23. Aufl., Berlin, 1907, p. 52.*

himself, in his *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (1530)<sup>2</sup> uses this translation of Matthew 12, 34 (cp. Luke 6, 45) as a sample of idiomatic rendition:

Als wenn Christus spricht: Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur. Wenn ich den Eseln sol folgen, die werden mir die buchstaben furlegen, und also dolmetzchen: Auß dem uberflus des hertzen redet der mund. Sage mir, Ist das deutsch geredt? Welcher deutscher verstehet solchs? Was ist uberflus des hertzen fur ein ding? Das kan kein deutscher sagen, Er wolt denn sagen, es sey das einer allzu ein gros hertz habe oder zu vil hertzes habe, wie wol das auch noch nicht recht ist: denn uberflus des hertzen ist kein deutsch, so wenig, als das deutsch ist, Uberflus des hauses, uberflus des kacheloffens, uberflus der banck, sondern also redet die mütter ym haus und der gemeine man: Wes das hertz vol ist, des gehet der mund uber, das heist gut deutsch geredt, des ich mich geflissen, und leider nicht allwege erreicht noch troffen habe, Denn die lateinischen buchstaben hindern aus der massen, seer gut deutsch zu reden.

Luther's coinage of this phrase thus seems to be definitely established. It can be cited, however, from the *Evangelibuch* of Johann Geiler von Kaisersberg,<sup>3</sup> published seven years before Luther's New Testament:

(ex habundantia cordus os loquor) was das hertz vol ist, des loufft der mund vber (fol. 152 verso, col. 2).

The misprints (*cordus, loquor, was*) need not disturb us, particularly as Geiler had no hand in the publication of the work, which first appeared seven years after the author's death, from a copy prepared by one of his hearers (*vß seinem mund von wort zu wort geschriben*). The only difference between the two texts is *louft vber* (Geiler) as against *gehet uber* (Luther), and this is merely a matter of individual choice, or perhaps of dialect.

According to the testimony of Johann Adelphus, adduced by Ernst Martin in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (VIII, 514)

<sup>2</sup> Luthers *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, 30. Bd. 2. Abt. p. 637.

<sup>3</sup> Das Euangelibuch Das buoch der Ewangellen durch das ganz iar, Mitt Predig vnd vßlegungen durch den wirdigen hochgelerten Doctor Johannes geiler von Keisersperg der zeit Predicant in dem hohen stift der Keiserlichen freien stat Straßburg . . . die er in seinen fier letsten Jaren gepredigt hat. Vnd daz vß seinem mund von wort zu wort geschriben. Anno. etc. M. d. vnd fier iar. . . Vnd ist vor nie getruckt. The *Privilegium* (fol. 2) is issued to: Dem Ersamen Johannes Grüningern . . . Straßburg . . . Actum Montags nach Martini Episcopi. Anno domini im xvc. vnd .xv. iar. The colophon at the end of the book also shows the date 1515.

it was Johannes Pauli who published Geiler's *Evangelibuch* in 1515, and again as *Evangelia mit vßlegung* in 1517. Either of these editions could have been in Luther's hands before he began the translation of the New Testament in 1521: a third edition of Geiler's work, published by Pauli in 1522 under the title *Evangelia das Plenarium*, is out of the question, on account of its date. All of these editions of Geiler are extremely rare; I had occasion, several years ago, to consult the *Evangelibuch* of 1515 at Berlin, for quite a different purpose, and incidentally noted this striking phrase: a detailed comparison with Luther's New Testament may yield further parallels. On the other hand, it is also possible that Geiler (or Pauli) and Luther, independently of Geiler, used a vernacular phrase that was current among the common people; in fact, Luther's words in the *Sendbrief* (*also redet die mütter ym haus und der gemeine man*) might be construed as supporting the latter alternative.

W. KURRELMEYER

---

### L'ACCENT ALLEMAND DANS BALZAC

Dans la chronique littéraire de la *Revue Bleue* du 20 avril 1918, Monsieur Antoine Albalat signale l'abus que l'on fait de l'accent allemand au théâtre et dans le roman. Le romancier Balzac surtout, dit-il, a fastidieusement exagéré cette ridicule prononciation qu'il prête à plusieurs de ses personnages. Ce parti pris finit par rendre quelques-uns de ses livres très pénibles à lire.

On pourrait ajouter que, non seulement cette prononciation rend la lecture pénible, mais encore, qu'un Allemand éprouverait une réelle difficulté à parler comme Schmucke ou le Baron Nucingen. Le procédé de Balzac consiste à remplacer le plus possible de consonnes sonores par des sourdes et vice versa, à changer les voyelles au hasard de la plume ou à introduire des changements de fantaisie comme par exemple: *filtrais* (voudrais), *bland* (plan).

Or, quels sont les traits caractéristiques de la prononciation des Allemands lorsqu'ils parlent notre langue? Comme dans la leur, les consonnes plosives et fricatives finales seront sourdes et brèves. C'est donc à tort que Balzac écrit *graze*, *faides*, *lisdes*, *lambes*, etc.,

pour *grâce, faites, liste, lampes*. Même des consonnes muettes changent: *tand, jambs* (tant, champs).<sup>1</sup>

En parlant français les Allemands ont une tendance à dévocaliser les consonnes initiales et même médiales. Cependant, dans certaines régions les sourdes et les sonores sont employées les unes pour les autres.<sup>2</sup> Balzac aurait-il étudié les prononciations dialectales? Les mots qui suivent seraient-ils le fruit d'observations minutieuses: *bermeddez, habbardement, madin, dripinal* (tribunal), *irridier, tégorai* (décoré), *togdeur, orguesdre*, etc.?

Le *s* initial allemand se prononce *z*. Balzac tantôt le change en *z*, tantôt le laisse *s*. Ainsi on trouve *zoigné* et *soigné, zuis* et *suis, ziblime* (sublime) et *sir* (sur), etc. Le *ş* intervocalique que les Allemands prononcent *ss* est quelquefois écrit correctement *ss*, souvent cependant *s* ou même pire *Z*: *rézonaple, cezi*. Le son de *J* ne se trouve guère que dans des mots d'emprunt, et nous savons combien les Allemands ont de la peine à prononcer ce son. Balzac est donc justifié de transcrire *je* ou *gens* par *che* et *chens*. Mais quand il écrit *gerger, jarman, gefeux*, il cherche la difficulté et ce pauvre Schmucke prononcerait beaucoup plus aisément *chercher, charmant* et *cheveux*. D'autres fois les changements résultent en combinaisons presque impossibles à prononcer, que ce soit en allemand ou en français. Qu'on se rende compte, par exemple, de l'effort qu'il faudrait pour prononcer le groupe *gsbl* dans *egsbliquer* en conservant le son *ss*. De tous les changements que j'ai relevés, le plus inattendu est certainement celui que nous trouvons dans ces mots: *tcheu, tchaire, tchéneralle*, pour *je, chère* et *général*.

Mais, si on peut découvrir dans le traitement des consonnes un semblant de méthode, quoique pas toujours soutenue, les voyelles, par contre, sont traitées avec la plus désinvolte fantaisie. Cependant notre système de voyelles diffère peu de celui des Allemands et la seule remarque qu'on puisse faire, c'est que les voyelles brèves sont relâchées et manquent peut-être de netteté, pas au point, en tout cas, de justifier les changements que nous trouvons dans Balzac.

Les *u* deviennent *i*, mais ce défaut d'arrondissement des lèvres se rencontre dans certaines prononciations dialectales, le change-

<sup>1</sup> Tous les exemples sont pris dans le *Cousin Pons, César Birotteau* et *La Maison Nucingen*.

<sup>2</sup> Les Saxons en particulier, selon M. H. C. Lancaster.

ment peut donc être considéré comme correct. On s'explique moins bien: *vordeine* (fortune), où *u* devient *ei*. Les *i* à leur tour deviennent *u*: *ruche* (riche), *chiste* (juste). Là encore, on peut admettre, à la rigueur, qu'une prononciation relâchée permette la confusion. Quant aux changements suivants on ne voit aucune explication possible: Les *eu* se changent au hasard en *i*, *ei*, *é* ou *u*: *tirecdir* (directeur), *cueir* et *quir* (cœur), *hire* et *heire* (heure), *seil* (seul), *indérière* (intérieur), *atié* (adieu), *fafure* (faveur), etc. Les *ou* se partagent *u* et *i*: *chur* (jour), *pir* (pour), *ébiser* (épouser), *vus* et *vis* (vous), *tude* (doute), etc. De temps en temps *è* devient *i*: *tis* (des) *iffits* (effets), ou même *a*: *ame* (aime). Enfin on trouve d'autres changements aussi bizarres qu'inattendus: *iffires* (affaires), *ile ha ei* (il a eu), *mennessir* et *meinnesir* (monsieur), *quemission* (commission), *reuyaliste* (royaliste); *hai*, *ei*, *ai*, *ed* (et); *didde*, *tidde*, *dudde*, *tudde*, *doude* (toute); *ed*, *esd*, *esde*, *esdre*, *hai* (est), etc. Et même avec l'aide du texte, il faut de la bonne volonté pour arriver à comprendre certains mots, par exemple: *chisdivier* (justifier), *vichis* (fichu), *ti dud* (du tout), *fis* (oui), etc.

Ce qui prouve que le système de Balzac consistait à introduire le plus possible de changements orthographiques, ce sont des mots où ces changements ne modifient en rien la prononciation: *lais* (les), *soissante* (soixante), *ke* et *ki* (que et qui), *mîle* (mille), *home* (homme), *phâmme* (femme), *sant* (cent), etc.

En résumé, quand on lit le français que parlent le Baron Nucingen et le doux et inoffensif Schmucke, on pourrait croire que ces deux Allemands sont animés du plus regrettable esprit de contradiction en matière de prononciation, ou se font un malin plaisir d'estropier notre langue. Pour terminer je citerai quelques phrases prises parmi les plus caractéristiques et laisserai au lecteur le plaisir d'en découvrir le sens:

Bons m'a did que j'étais enduré de goguins.  
Gu'imborde ou l'on meird!  
Vis ki fis edes vaite plessier.  
Cesde gonfeni.  
C'hai neiffe cende vrance de rende.  
Mon seil pessoin esd te vimer ma bibe.

RENÉ DAUDON

Haverford, Pa.



THE PLOT OF CONRAD'S *THE DUEL*

Of the genesis of his brilliantly ironic story of *The Duel* Joseph Conrad, thirteen years later, said in his preface to *A Set of Six* in the Personal Edition:<sup>1</sup>

Its pedigree is extremely simple. It springs from a ten-line paragraph in a small provincial paper published in the South of France. That paragraph, occasioned by a duel with fatal ending between two well-known Parisian personalities, referred for some reason or other to the "well-known fact" of two officers in Napoleon's Grand Army having fought a series of duels in the midst of great wars and on some futile pretext. The pretext was never disclosed. I had therefore to invent it; and I think that, given the character of the two officers which I had to invent, too, I have made it sufficiently convincing by the mere force of its absurdity.

The statement sounds sincere, and was almost certainly made in good faith. In fact, however, Conrad must have read much more than he remembered. Not the mere germ of the story but its whole outline, including the "futile pretext" Conrad claims as his own, had long been in print. The version which follows appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for September 1858.<sup>2</sup> So close are the parallels that the text must be quoted in full:

The late Paris duels have called up the subject of dueling anew; and among the most extraordinary affairs of that nature which inquiry has brought to light, is the story of a duel commencing in 1794 and ending only in 1813. . . .

In 1794, then, there lived a Captain of hussars, Fournier by name, at Strasbourg, who was the most hot-headed and quarrelsome man in all that region. Again and again he had slain his man in duels, but no successes seemed to satiate his taste for this sort of murder. On one occasion he had wantonly provoked a young man, named Blumm—who was a great favorite among the good bourgeoisie of Strasbourg—and as wantonly had slain him.

The whole town was full of excitement, and the whole town condemned Fournier as his murderer. Still, dueling was honorable; who should venture to punish the murderer, who was only [a] duelist?

It happened that, upon the night of the burial of poor Blumm, a great ball, long time announced, was given by the military commander of the

---

<sup>1</sup> New York, 1920, p. x. Conrad wrote the story at Montpellier during December, 1906, and January, 1907 (see G. Jean-Aubrey, *Joseph Conrad Life and Letters*, New York, 1927, II, 4). It was separately published in America in 1908 as *The Point of Honour*.

<sup>2</sup> XVII, 559-60. The item is part of "Our Foreign Gossip" in "The Editor's Easy Chair."

place. Fournier was among the invited guests; but the general commanding, foreseeing what unpleasant *rencontres* might grow out of his presence, gave orders to his aid-de-camp, Captain Dupont, to station himself at the door, and, citing the order of the general, to give *congé* to Fournier.

Dupont accepted the commission. Fournier in due time presented himself. Dupont addressed him: "Fournier, what are you doing here on the night of poor Blumm's burial?"

"Ah! *c'est toi*, Dupont; *bon!* I come to the ball, naturally enough."

"And I am here to prevent you, by my general's orders."

"Ah! *c'est ça!* I can not fight the general, for his rank; you will, perhaps, have no objection?—you who commit impertinences at second-hand."

Dupont accepted the challenge; in a few days they fought, and Dupont succeeded in giving the desperado a severe sword wound; but Fournier, even as he fell, claimed a new meeting. On his recovery another duel was fought, in which Fournier wounded Dupont severely. But Dupont, maddened by the ruffianism of his antagonist, and trusting to his skill, insisted, upon his recovery, on a third trial. Fournier declared for pistols, being himself unfailing in his aim, and amusing himself on leisure evenings by shattering the pipes in the mouths of the soldiers with pistol-balls.

Dupont, however, claimed a privilege of the military service, and the trial was renewed with swords. Both were slightly wounded. Upon this a duel convention was drawn up between them (still in existence), running in this way:

1st. As often as MM. Dupont and Fournier find themselves within thirty leagues of each other, they shall meet half-way between, for a duel with swords.

2d. If either of the combatants finds himself restrained by the exigencies of the service, the other shall make the entire journey, in order to effect a meeting.

3d. No excuse, except such as may grow out of the exigencies of military duty, shall be admissible.

The convention was executed in good faith; on every occasion when it was possible for the two hot-heads to meet, they met, and fought desperately.

A most extraordinary correspondence sprung up between them, of which we give a sample.

"I am invited," writes one, "to breakfast with the staff of *chasseurs*, at Luneville; and since you are in that place, upon leave of absence, I shall accept the invitation, and shall hope for the opportunity of giving you another sword thrust.

"Truly yours."

Or again:

"Dear Friend,—I shall pass through Strasbourg at noon, on the 5th of November next. You will find me at the Hôtel des Postes: we will have a fight."

Sometimes the promotion of one or the other, by destroying their military equality, interfered with the prosecution of their agreeable engagements. Thus Fournier writes:

"My dear Dupont,—I learn that the Emperor has made you General of Brigade. Accept my felicitations. The appointment gives me special pleasure, since it restores you to equality of rank with me, and gives us opportunity to renew fight, which I shall surely do on the first occasion."

The affair, naturally enough, attracted great attention in its day. Each bore the marks of numerous wounds: each was anxious to compass the death of the other. Both, however, were admirable swordsmen, and held religiously to the law of the duel, which forbade a second thrust after blood had once been drawn.

On one occasion, it is related that they met unexpectedly by night in a chalet of Switzerland.

"Ah, Dupont, it is you! Let us fight!"

Dupont threw aside his cloak, and put himself in position. As they parried thrust after thrust, the following conversation took place:

"*Parbleu!* I thought you were in the interior."

"No, I am ordered here."

"Good! We shall be near by. Are you lately arrived?"

"This instant."

"Very good to think of me." And as he spoke Dupont's sword pierced his neck-cloth, grazing his neck, and pinning him to the wall.

The noise of the altercation had drawn in officers from a neighboring chalet, who separated the antagonists.

So through fourteen years the long duel trailed, satisfaction not being given or gained.

At length Dupont found himself on the eve of marriage. His *fiancée* insisted the strife should be ended. He paid a visit to Fournier; he represented to him the inconvenience of the feud and the intervention of his bride. He proposed a final meeting.

A duel should be fought with pistols.

Fournier, conscious of his force in that way, expressed surprise.

Dupont says, "I know this. But I have a scheme to put us on a level. A friend of mine has a pleasant copse, inclosed by a high wall; there are two gates—one to the north, one to the south. At noon precisely, tomorrow, you shall enter at the north gate, pistol in hand; I shall enter by the south. Once within the copse, each shall seek his occasion to fire."

The terms were accepted. At noon the next day they entered; the gates were closed; they advanced cautiously from thicket to thicket. At length they discovered each other, and at the same instant each took refuge behind a trunk. Five minutes passed: Dupont slowly thrust his arm beyond shelter; the bark flew, there was a quick report, and one ball of Fournier's was lost. Five minutes more, and Dupont cautiously thrust his hat into sight: on the instant it was pierced, the ball grazing his fingers.

He now marched out coolly: Fournier left his shelter, with the empty pistol in his hand—cool to the last.

Dupont took deliberate aim at his heart—stopped. "I have your life in my hands," said he. "I give it you on on this condition—that if you ever harass me, or provoke me to renew this long fight, I shall have the benefit of two balls before you fire." The conditions were accepted; the fourteen years of duel were ended; Dupont was married; the story is done.

Save that he reduced his officers a step in rank, and half altered Dupont into D'Hubert and Fournier into Feraud, Conrad took the initial situation practically as it stood. In his story the scene is still Strasbourg, Feraud a hussar, D'Hubert on the commandant's staff. The provocation is the same: Feraud has killed a civilian—whose name, however, Conrad omits as immaterial—in a duel, and D'Hubert interrupts his attendance at a social gathering by delivering the general's orders for his immediate return to quarters. Even the wording of Feraud's challenge is similar: "I can't call the general to account for his behaviour, but you are going to answer me for yours."

In the ensuing three duels, Conrad follows the same sequence: Feraud is wounded in the first, D'Hubert in the second, both are injured in the third. The later events also follow the same general order, with frequent interruptions to hostilities by service on different fronts and temporary inequality in rank. In Conrad's version, likewise, the feud ends, just before D'Hubert's marriage, with a pistol duel wherein the combatants stalk each other in a wood. Feraud, like Fournier, is the better shot: D'Hubert draws his fire, and Feraud's bullet chips the bark of the tree. Feraud's fruitless expenditure of his second and last shot leaves him no choice but to accept D'Hubert's terms, and D'Hubert is free to marry and live happy.

Some of Conrad's modifications are significant. By advancing the initial date from 1794 to 1800 he gives unity of background, with the discipline and glamor of Napoleon always a part of the picture. (Anyway, the dates in the *Harper* story are irreconcilable with the twice repeated statement that the duel lasted fourteen years.) By introducing numerous minor characters Conrad not only enriches the social and military panorama of the background but achieves such details of pattern as the Alsatian maid's attempted intervention for Feraud in the first duel and Adèle's for D'Hubert in the last. Moreover, the first duel, like the last, is fought without the presence of seconds. For the formal contract and exchange of letters, Conrad substitutes a series of personal

glimpses of the combatants which culminates in the epic details of the retreat from Moscow. And finally, in the pistol fight, Conrad supplies, instead of Dupont's somewhat ignoble repetition of the same ruse to draw Fournier's fire, the richly comic details of D'Hubert's attempt, by means of a primitive periscope, to watch his front and his rear at the same time.

What then are we to conclude in regard to Conrad's statement in the 1920 preface? It seems incredible that a man of his intellectual and artistic integrity would have claimed credit for inventing details which he knew were borrowed. Even if he wished for some reason to conceal the extent of his indebtedness he had only to word his statement a little more vaguely. The following explanation is admittedly pure conjecture, but it seems plausible.

The story in *Harper's* is obviously a close paraphrase from some French newspaper. No doubt the tale, as so often happens, continued to appear in the papers whenever editors were short of material or when current events offered an excuse for reviving it. In all likelihood Conrad read it during his apprenticeship in French vessels out of Marseilles between 1874 and 1878. When he came again, thirty years later, on a brief reference to the story, the earlier reading had passed completely out of his conscious memory. He was working under heavy strain in 1906 and 1907: his wife and children had been seriously ill; he himself had suffered repeated attacks of gout, following the "bronchitis, influenza, and an obstinate insomnia" which had afflicted him in Capri in 1905<sup>3</sup>; the ever-present worry over finances was more intense than usual. It would scarcely be exaggeration to say that his mental condition during much of this time was like Sir Walter Scott's when he wrote *The Bride of Lammermoor*. In such circumstances he may well have thought that he was inventing details when in fact he was merely drawing them from his subconscious memory.

In any case, the discovery of the source does not affect the artistic validity of the finished work. It merely puts *The Duel* in the same class with *The Inn of the Two Witches*, where also Conrad used a traditional story of which the literary possibilities had never before been adequately developed. He was right in telling J. B. Pinker that *The Duel* was good.<sup>4</sup> Its having come to

<sup>3</sup> Jean-Aubrey, II, 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

him ready-made as to plot simply explains why it is so much gayer than most of the stories he developed from his own resources.

J. DELANCEY FERGUSON

*Western Reserve University*

---

### A SOURCE OF CONRAD'S *SUSPENSE*

In Joseph Conrad's last and unfinished novel, *Suspense*, there is a description of a meeting between 'Adèle' and Napoleon Bonaparte. 'Adèle' remarks that he spoke to her but once, at a ball; and continues:

In the intervals of dancing the Emperor came down alone, speaking only to the women. . . . When he came opposite me he stopped. I am certain he knew who I was, but he asked me my name. I told him.

'Your husband lives in his province?'

'Yes, sire.'

'Your husband employs much labour, I hear. I am grateful to him for giving work to the people. This is the proper use of wealth. Hasn't he served in the English army in India?'

His tone was friendly. I said I didn't know that, but I did know that he had fought against them there.

He smiled in a fascinating manner and said: 'That's very possible. A soldier of fortune. He is a native of Piedmont, is he not?'

'Yes, sire.'

'But you are French, entirely French. We have a claim on you. How old are you?'

I told him. He said: 'You look younger.' Then he came nearer to me and speaking in a confidential tone said: 'You have no children. I know, I know. It isn't your fault, but you should try to make some other arrangement. Believe me, I am giving you good advice.'

I was dumb with astonishment. He gave me again a very gracious smile and went on. That is the only conversation I ever had with the Emperor.<sup>1</sup>

Not long after reading *Suspense* I happened to glance through the volumes of the *Memoirs of the Comtesse de Boigne*,<sup>2</sup> and came upon the following:

. . . the Emperor came down alone and went round the room, speaking exclusively to the ladies. . . . According to his custom, he also asked my name, which I told him.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Suspense*, New York, 1925, pp. 145-6.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. M. Charles Nicoulaud, New York, 1908.

'You live at Beauregard?'

'Yes, Sire.'

'It is a beautiful spot, and your husband employs much labour there; I am grateful to him for the service he does to the country, as I am to all who employ workmen. He has been in the English army? . . . He is a Savoyard, is he not?'

'Yes, Sire.'

'But you are French, entirely French, and we therefore claim you, for you are not one of those rights easily surrendered.'

I bowed.

'How old are you?'

I told him.

'And frank into the bargain. You look much younger.'

I bowed again. He stepped back half a pace, and then came up to me, speaking lower in a confidential tone:

'You have no children? I know that is not your fault, but you should make better arrangements. Believe me, I am giving you good advice.'

I remained stupefied; he looked at me for a moment with a gracious smile, and went on to my neighbour. . . .<sup>3</sup>

What incentive for research! Careful study of the other characters in Conrad's fascinating novel and of the life and family of the Comtesse de Boigne as told in her *Memoirs*, reveals other similarities. 'Dr. Martel,' the political agent of the story, resembles in both his name and the circumstances of his life, the English doctor, Joseph Head Marshall, who was associated with Dr. Edward Jenner of vaccine fame. Without doubt, Marshall forms the basis of the character 'Dr. Martel.' The character of 'Sir Charles Latham' is founded on that of Sir John Legard, an Englishman with an estate in Yorkshire, who, according to the *Memoirs*, married a Miss Aston after hearing that she had taken more seriously than he intended the attentions he had paid her. 'Sir Charles' in *Suspense* marries a 'Miss Aston'—and for the same reason. Lady Legard was beautiful, says the Comtesse de Boigne,

but absolutely unfitted to share the retirement of a distinguished man. . . . Her sole responsibility in the household was confined to the ordering the dinner. . . . She would never have dared to ask for a horse to go for a ride, much less to pay a call, but if her husband said to her in a solemn voice, 'My lady, it would be advisable for you to call at such and such a house,' her heart would leap for joy. 'Certainly, Sir John, most certainly,' and off she went to get out her finery.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 244.

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 106.

Conrad's description runs thus:

Her household power was confined to ordering the dinner. . . . She would never have dreamed of asking for horses for a visit in the neighbourhood, but when her husband remarked, 'I think it would be advisable for you, my lady, to call at such and such a house,' her face would light up, she would answer with alacrity, 'Certainly, Sir Charles,' and go off to array herself. . . .<sup>5</sup>

Sir John Legard is portrayed in the *Memoirs* as 'domineering, generous, imperious'; to his wife, 'always inconsiderate, and often severe; a perfect representative of the independent country gentleman. . . . He . . . was endowed with a brilliant intellect, the most delicate taste, the most lively imagination, with a supreme desire for intellectual intercourse. . . . In his youth he had been very handsome . . . but later had grown stout.'<sup>6</sup>

Conrad pictures him as 'Sir Charles Latham' in these words:

As the years went on Sir Charles aged more than he ought to have done, and even began to grow a little stout, but no one could fail to see that he had been a very handsome man in his time. . . . Without being gentle he was naturally kind and hospitable. His native generosity was so well known that no one was surprised when he offered the shelter of his Yorkshire house to a family of French refugees, the Marquis and the Marquise d'Armand, with their little daughter Adèle. They had arrived in England in a state of almost complete destitution, but with two servants who had shared the . . . miseries of their flight. . . .<sup>7</sup>

In another passage of the *Memoirs* the Comtesse de Boigne recalls interesting and personal details:

I was so excessively shy that I blushed whenever anyone spoke to me or looked at me. This failing is not always regarded with due sympathy. It was a real suffering in my case, and reached such a pitch that I was often choked by tears aroused by nothing but an excessive embarrassment which was quite unjustifiable.<sup>8</sup>

In *Suspense*, 'Adèle' talks with 'Cosmo' of her girlhood:

Would you believe that when I was a girl I was so shy that I used to blush crimson whenever anybody looked at me or spoke to me? It's a failing which does not meet with much sympathy. And yet my suffering was very real. It would reach such a pitch at times that I was ready to cry.<sup>9</sup>

She tells 'Cosmo' of the offer made for her hand by the 'Count de Montevezzo':

<sup>5</sup> *Suspense*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>6</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 105, 107.

<sup>7</sup> *Suspense*, pp. 20, 21.

<sup>8</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 117.

<sup>9</sup> *Suspense*, p. 129.



I was getting on for sixteen. . . . No one ever paid the slightest attention to me. The only genuine passion in my heart was filial love. . . . He [Montevesso] . . . left a most fugitive impression, but the very next morning he sent his English friend to ask my parents for my hand. . . .<sup>10</sup>

Here is the passage from the *Memoirs*:

I was sixteen years of age. No one had ever paid me the smallest attention—at any rate I had not noticed anything of the kind. . . . The only passion in my heart was filial love. . . . He [the Count de Boigne] came and went without attracting particular attention from us . . . and . . . commissioned [his friend] to ask my hand in marriage.<sup>11</sup>

An interview was arranged at the house of a lady who was an intimate of the d'Osmonds, between the young girl and her suitor,—at her own request. The *Memoirs* continue:

He was exactly punctual. I then committed the grave though generous mistake of telling him that I did not care for him in the least, and probably never should, but that if he were willing to secure my parents' future independence, my gratitude would be so great that I could marry him without reluctance. . . . He assured me that he did not flatter himself with the possibility of inspiring any deeper feeling. . . . Twelve days later I was married. . . . General de Boigne was forty-nine years of age.<sup>12</sup>

And here is the same scene from the novel,—which 'Adèle' recalls for 'Cosmo.' She says:

They were some time in finding him. I waited. . . . He arrived out of breath. . . . I, who used to blush violently at the smallest provocation, didn't feel the slightest embarrassment in addressing that big stiff man so much older than myself. I could not appreciate what a fatal mistake I was committing by telling him I didn't care for him in the least, and probably never should; but that if he would secure my parents' future comfort my gratitude would be so great that I could marry him without reluctance and be his loyal friend and wife for life. He stood there stiff and ominous, and told me that he didn't flatter himself with the possibility of inspiring any deeper feeling. . . . Three weeks afterwards I was married.<sup>13</sup>

If Conrad had lived to finish his novel he might have indicated the sources from which he spun the fabric of *Suspense*—weaving to his glowing pattern, with his incomparable skill, the many strands of history and fiction. His genius caught and made to live again the atmosphere which at that period touched all the countries of

<sup>10</sup> *Suspense*, pp. 132, 133.

<sup>12</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 132-3.

<sup>11</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 131.

<sup>13</sup> *Suspense*, pp. 134, 136.

Europe—that feeling of *suspense* hanging like a mist above the restless whirlpool of events—which gave him the title for his story.

MIRIAM HATHEWAY WOOD

*Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada*

### KATHERINE MANSFIELD AND CHEKHOV

The influence of Chekhov on Katherine Mansfield has often been remarked. She herself freely expressed admiration and a feeling of kinship for her Russian predecessor. Her husband, Mr. J. Middleton Murry, in his edition of her *Journal*, however, says that critics over-estimate her debt to Chekhov, and that her literary development would have been much the same had she never read his stories.

This may well be true. Yet a remarkable parallel is to be found between one of her early short stories, "The Child-Who-Was-Tired" from the volume *In a German Pension*, and a story of Chekhov's called, in its English versions, "Sleepyhead" or "Sleepy."<sup>1</sup> In *The Life of Katherine Mansfield* by R. E. Mantz and J. Middleton Murry<sup>2</sup> the inception of her story is described: "Superficially, it is a realistic story of peasant life; but in essence it is nothing of the kind. 'The Child who was Tired' is indubitably herself in the summer of 1909—the Katherine wearied with pain and crying in vain for rest—'the frightened child lost in a funeral procession.' The peasant household is not any peasant household that Katherine experienced—actually the Bavarian peasants were kind to her, and she liked them—but merely a symbol of her experience of life."

Yet the similarity between the two stories is too great for us to suppose them entirely independent. The central idea of Chekhov's tale would be unlikely to occur of itself to another writer. It is briefly, and so is Katherine Mansfield's, the story of a servant girl, who, overworked all day, is compelled to stay awake at night to

<sup>1</sup> This had appeared in an English translation by R. E. C. Long in 1903. "The-Child-Who-Was-Tired" was published originally, with the additional title of "Bavarian Babies" in *The New Age* for February 24, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> London, 1933, p. 326.

rock the baby. Crazed by fatigue and lack of sleep, she strangles the child and at once falls asleep.

The period of time covered by the action in Katherine Mansfield's story is slightly shorter: she begins in the early morning when the girl is aroused by a blow, while Chekhov begins during the preceding night with the girl's desperate efforts to stay awake. Both end the following night after the mistress's final command to rock the baby. But the likeness of the two stories does not end with the outline; the mood, and even much of the detail, are the same. At the crisis of both stories the girl's stupefied mind seizes with a feeling of great discovery upon the idea that it is the baby who prevents her sleeping. She thinks of strangling it; without any question or moral conflict, she laughs with pleasure at the thought; and when she has finished she lies happily down upon the floor and falls fast asleep. The action of the preceding day, the account of a servant girl's daily work, would naturally be much the same—splitting wood, lighting the oven, "heating" the coffee (or the samovar), washing the floor (or the steps), peeling potatoes—these details one would expect to find, and one does, in both. But there are others. In Chekhov's story there is a recurrent picture or motif which appears when the child in spite of herself has fallen asleep in the night and dreams of "a broad high road covered with liquid mud," with people and wagons, and tall hills on either side. This is repeated after she has been wakened by a "sharp slap behind the ear," and it recurs the next night before she thinks of killing the baby. Katherine Mansfield's story has a similar recurring motif introduced in the first sentence: "she was just beginning to walk along a little white road with tall black trees on either side . . . where nobody walked at all, when a hand gripped her shoulder, shook her, slapped her ear." This vision too recurs at the same points in the story, once soon after she has got up and again just before the crisis as well as at other moments during the day. The sensations of sleepiness and fatigue are on the whole rather different, but in both the child's neck aches, and objects seem to grow large before her eyes: in Chekhov's story it is the master's golosh which as she is cleaning it, "grows, swells and fills the whole room"; in "The Child-Who-Was-Tired" the man and his wife sitting at supper seemed to "swell to an immense size as she watched them, and then become smaller than dolls."

The day's work in both stories is prolonged by the arrival of visitors in the evening with further parallel commands to "set the samovar" and to "put on the coffee."

There are other rather minute likenesses; there are differences as well. The most important of the latter is one which shows the increasing tendency of the more modern writer toward concentration of time, scene, and interest. I have said that the Russian story begins earlier on the night before the crisis. The interval is occupied by the child's half-waking dreams of her early life, by means of which Chekhov gives us rather a complete picture of her past. In the story of Katherine Mansfield we are kept more strictly to the present scene, the child's past being suggested only by a few words of the mistress which she overhears.

The explanation that I suggest for the similarity, which amounts almost to a reproduction of the same story, is offered only tentatively. In spite of the very close parallel there was probably no deliberate plagiarism on the part of Katherine Mansfield. It seems unlikely, too, that, if she were experimenting to see what she could do with the same plot, she would have published it without acknowledgment. Only a less exigent egoism than hers would be likely to seek, or find, satisfaction by an accomplishment not really her own. It seems more probably a case of unconscious memory, a phenomenon common enough in matters of detail, though not common in such complete instances. This is, of course, only surmise. But the interpretation is somewhat strengthened by another resemblance which I think is not fanciful, though it is scarcely susceptible of definite proof, of one of Katherine Mansfield's later stories to a novel of Henry James. The fragment called "The Dove's Nest," which is about a girl named Milly, suggests, in something more subtle than its title and heroine's name, certain parts in the latter half of James's *The Wings of the Dove*. Something of the spirit—the color of the air, one might call it, in the two houses (one in the south of France, the other in Italy), the two women living in each of them—much in the heroine herself, and in the author's unspoken attitude toward her, a delicate, romanticized, veiled portrayal, though it is quite indefinable, seems distinctly similar. In this case a writer who was deliberately borrowing an atmosphere would hardly have taken care to point the indebtedness by the use of the reminiscent title and a heroine with

the same name. There is no similarity here of action or of situation, and the whole is typical of those vague, unconscious reminiscences of which literary history affords any number of examples. If I am right in drawing this parallel, the probability that the earlier story was an unconscious imitation of Chekhov is somewhat strengthened. One feature of a certain type of imaginative mind is the power of taking in that which appeals to it with so much activity of its own, so little of mere passive appreciation, that the memory afterward will seem to bear the stamp of its own imagination. Whether this interpretation is correct or not, the case itself is an interesting one—how interesting, only those who read the four stories together, and then read Katherine Mansfield's letters and Journal, can know.

ELISABETH SCHNEIDER

*Temple University*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Luther's German Bible.* An Historical Presentation together with a Collection of Sources by M. REU. Columbus, Ohio: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1934. xiv, 364, 226 pp., 14 plates. \$4.00.

The book is divided into two separately numbered parts, namely the Historical Presentation (pp. 1-364) and the Source Material (pp. 1\*-217\*). The chapter headings of the Historical Presentation give a general idea of its contents: I. The Bible in the Middle Ages; II. Luther and the Bible; III. Luther's Translation of the New Testament; IV. Luther's Translation of the Old Testament and the Complete Bible of 1534; V. Luther's Work on the Bible from 1534 till his death; VI. The distinctive characteristics of Luther's German Bible. These six chapters are followed by seventy-seven pages of notes, whose purpose is to document the statements made in the Historical Presentation.

The Source Material offers selections, in Latin, from Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*; and in German, from the Monsee Gospel, Notker, the Windberg Psalter, the *Wenzelbibel*, and other manuscripts, as well as from the printed Mentel Bible (ca. 1466), in part with the variants of the later editions, in part with the text of Zainer, Koburger, and Silvanus Otmar (1518) in parallel columns. These are followed by selections from the Low German Bibles, from the History Bibles, from the German Plenaries or

Pericopes, and from a number of German Psalters. The reader is thus enabled to compare Luther's translation, in quite a number of passages, with older German versions.

The Source Materials for Chapter II, from Luther's Lectures and Commentaries (on the Psalms, on Romans, on Hebrews, on Galatians) are given in English translation; for Chapters III-V there are selections from various translations of Luther, from 1517 to 1546, again in the original, whilst selected Prefaces of Luther (to the Psalter of 1531, to Romans of 1522) are again in English translation.

In his preface the author modestly disclaims "original researches" in the preparation of his book:

here the scattered source materials that were discovered and edited by others are made available in connected form. The author can truthfully claim that he has worked through all the available material, scattered as it is, down to the most recent publications of this year, and on the basis of this extensive literature presents the first comprehensive picture of the origin of Luther's German Bible. New as many of its conclusions are and often far removed from traditional views they nevertheless give the latest conclusions of historical science, even in the smallest details.

Instead of discussing all these details, let us take up one of the more important questions treated by Dr. Reu, namely that of Luther's use of earlier German translations. A brief summary of the conclusions of the various scholars that have dealt with the question is given on pages 352 and 353: the staunch Catholics among them usually conclude that Luther made extensive use of the earlier German Bible, while the staunch Protestants are sure that he was not acquainted with the older translations. The publication of the pre-Lutheran German translation, in the years 1904-1915, promoted intensive study of the question, and in 1922, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, Gustav Roethe came to the following conclusion:

Für das N. T. ist die vorlutherische gedruckte Bibel in der Zeinerschen Redaction ausgiebig und regelmäßig herangezogen; doch wurde diese systematisch in Wortschatz und Syntax modernisiert. Besonders eng ist der Anschluß in der Apokalypse, freier in den Evangelien; besonders frei in den Paulinischen Briefen, wo im Interesse deutlicher Lehre viele tiefer eingreifende Neuübertragungen einsetzen. In zahlreichen Einzelstellen klingt Luthers N. T. auch an den Codex Teplensis an; hier werden aber nur Gedächtnisanlehnungen vorliegen. Das A. T. Luthers ist in Wortschatz, Syntax und Rhythmus reicher, zeigt erhöhten Kunststil und demgemäß eine bewußt altertümlichere Sprache.

The detailed proofs for these various statements, which Roethe promised to give later, seem never to have been published. After his death, D. theol. Alb. Freytag took up the task, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy of April 25, 1929, where he compares sixteen passages in the O. T.; his strongest passage is I. Sam. (I. Reg.) 2, 13, where *fuscina tridens* of the Vulgate, an exact rendition of the Hebrew, is given by Mentel and Zainer as *einen*

*dreizügigen krewel*, by Koburger as *einen dreyzenigen krewel*. In his first draft Luther has the word *dreytzungig*, which Freytag explains as a misreading of *dreizügig*. In other passages Luther, according to Freytag, agrees with Zainer, as against Mentel: therefore Zainer must have been the edition used by Luther. All of this is based on the single word *dreytzungig*, which is assumed not to occur in any other aids accessible to Luther.

In the Weimar edition of the Luther Bible (vi, 595-637) Freytag gives "Ergänzende Erläuterungen und Anmerkungen über Luthers Benutzung der deutschen Bibel des MA. (Zainerbibel) bei seiner Übersetzung des N. T. (Matthäus bis Apostelgeschichte)." His *Hauptbeweisstelle* concerns the translation of the Greek *χαίρε* or *χαίρετε*, Latin *Ave*, *Avete*, occurring at four places, namely Matth. 26, 49; 27, 29; 28, 9; Mark 15, 18. In all the editions from 1522 to 1527 Luther renders this one word by *gott grus dich*, or *got grusse euch*. As the identical translation is found in the pre-Lutheran Bibles from Mentel through the Zainer group, Freytag considers this as a striking proof that Luther used Zainer. He is aware of the fact that at least three glossaries of the fifteenth century have the same translation, and also remarks casually that Luther, in sermons of the years 1519-21, uses the forms: *Gegrusât seistw*, *Gehab dich wol*, *du bist angnemb bey goth*, *Grueß dich Goth*, *Goth ist dir holdt*, *Got ist mit dir*. Nevertheless Freytag is convinced that Luther used Zainer in the above passages from Matthew and Mark, which constitute his *Hauptbeweisstelle*. I must confess that I do not see the cogency of his argument, which is accepted by Reu. If Luther, as early as 1519-1521, uses the phrase *Grueß dich Goth* in sermons, why should he have to go to Zainer in 1522 for such an idiomatic expression?

Elsewhere Reu usually follows Walther's *Deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters* in his evaluation of the medieval translations. On page 22 we read that "The Zurich manuscript likewise possesses the prefaces to the four Gospels and these prefaces coincide with those in the first printed Bible, the Mentel Bible." The uninitiated might assume from this that the text of the Zurich MS is identical with that of Mentel: this is not the case, and Walther (col. 488) is very specific in his statement: only the Latin from which the two texts descend is identical in content, the translations themselves are entirely different. On page 7 Reu speaks of the National Library in Vienna, and also on page 23, whereas on page 20 the Monsee MS is assigned to the Vienna Hofbibliothek; similar references are found on p. 296, as well as Plate I: he does not know that the Hofbibliothek of the old régime is now the Nationalbibliothek. The Monsee MS, by the way, was edited by George Allison Hench, not George Allison, as Reu states on page 300. It would be interesting to know where Reu gets his authority for the statement (p. 67): "Charlemagne . . . must have had some connection with the prepa-

ration of that Bible of which a fragment has been preserved in the 'Monseer Matthaeus.'” On page 25 Reu mentions MSS at Maihingen, Nuremberg, and elsewhere, but fails to note the earliest MS of this group, of the year of 1436, in the British Museum, because this is not mentioned by Walther. The second part of Vollmer's work, mentioned on page 52, actually appeared in the summer of 1933, and was followed in the summer of 1934 by still another instalment: *Verdeutschung der Paulinischen Briefe von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte mit neuen Texten, synoptischen Tabellen und 3 Bildtafeln* hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit Fritz Jülicher, Willy Lüdtke und Richard Newald von Hans Vollmer.

In his preface (p. ix) Reu informs us that his book was written in German and translated into English by several friends. To this fact are doubtless due readings such as: *the Sorger Bible* (p. 33) instead of *the Sorg Bible*; *Neither Pietsch nor Maurer . . . have entered* (p. 47); *the Freisinger Bishop* (p. 68) instead of *the Bishop of Freising*; *M. Philippum, Mattheum Aurogallum* (p. 212) instead of *M. Philippus, Mattheus Aurogallus*; *see in the Neuen deutschen Bibel* (p. 235); *To this aufs neue zugerichteten Bible* (p. 239); *foreign printers* (p. 239) meaning *printers outside of Wittenberg*; *much untenable opinions have been voiced* (p. 345); *hand copy* (p. 359) a translation of the German *Handexemplar*.

There is a superabundance of misprints, particularly in foreign names and texts: for example, *Monse* (p. 20) for *Monsee*; *Retlev* (p. 23) for *Rotlev*; *Thueringians, Thueringia* (pp. 138 ff.); *Sachsenhausen* (p. 142) for *Sachsenhausen*; *Hehrew* (p. 197); *Liebharer* (p. 277); *Balileae* (p. 289) for *Basileae*; *Migné* (p. 292) for *Migne*; *Hingden* (p. 293) for *Higden*; *Francaise, moyan age, francaise, Jahrhundertts* on the same page; *Osterreich* (p. 296); *Prebisch* (p. 300) for *Priebsch*; *ausfürlichem* (p. 300); *E. Wolfe* (p. 330) as against *E. Wolf* (p. 331); *handschrifslichen* (p. 332); *Christium* (p. 334) for *Christum*; *Abenlandes* (p. 337); *Iduicium* (p. 339) for *Iudicium*; *Schrifsprinzips* (p. 345); *Dobschuctz* (p. 349) for *Dobschütz*; *terniores* (p. 355) for *terniones*; *Assonaz* (p. 363) for *Assonanz*; *urzgiton* (p. 10\*) for *uragiton*; *sie wip* (ib.) for *sin wip*; *suhstuole* (p. 11\*) for *suhtstuole*; *zeflinzzet* (ib.) for *zefliuzzet*; *none dem* (ib.) for *uone dem*; *Faust-Schoepper* (p. 220\*) for *Faust-Schoeffer*.

This formidable list of shortcomings would no doubt be augmented by close reading of the source material, of which I have tested only a few random passages. The book, nevertheless, should prove stimulating to the general reader, for whom it is primarily intended, and the wealth of material given in the notes will be useful also to the serious student.

W. KURRELMEYER



*Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina.* Auspiciis Instituti Sanctae Sabinae ad codicum fidem edita. I. Super Oratione Dominica. Edidit RAYMUNDUS KLIBANSKY. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1934. RM. 2.50. Complete edition estimated at RM. 80.

Meister Eckhart's German works were rediscovered about a century ago, and, although a reliable critical edition is not yet available, they are not as completely inaccessible as his writings in Latin. The latter, however, are of extreme importance for the understanding of Eckhart and the spiritual situation of his time. They reveal that the current picture of the enthusiastic Medieval mystic has to be supplemented by that of a rational thinker. Whereas the ideas of Thomas Aquinas and Dante find their climax in a mystic immersion in God, Eckhart's mysticism is founded on an under-structure of philosophic-theological thinking in the scholastic fashion. This first issue of Eckhart's Latin writings, which in addition to a general introduction to the history and tradition of Eckhart's works contains his comments on the Lord's Prayer, gives a good idea of the subtle art of analytical interpretation and the industrious compilation of the Medieval monk, although it is only one of his minor Latin writings.

The text of the manuscript is supplemented and emended with the help of quotations and plagiarisms of later writers, especially those of Jordanus of Quedlinburg. In the very extensive critical apparatus, the most important variants are given. It also contains passages from other works of the author which may serve to clarify the idea presented. The source material is not limited in the strictly philological sense to evident borrowings from other authors, but is meant to serve the purpose of placing Eckhart in his proper intellectual environment. The apparatus finally offers testimonies, quotations and annotations of later Medieval authors, especially the valuable comments of Nicolaus Cusanus. This carefully prepared and extremely rich edition of Eckhart's Latin writings promises to become an important contribution to the study of Medievalism and the basis for further fruitful research.

The edition is prepared under the auspices of the *Institutum Sanctae Sabinae* of the Dominican Order in Rome. It is the result of years of research and embodies two independent studies, one by Father Gabriel Théry and the other by Raymond Klibansky, a collaborator of the Heidelberg Cusanus edition. Strange to say, another edition of the great mystic, which is to include his German works also, has just been planned by German Eckhart scholars, and a somewhat peculiarly worded announcement of it in the issue of *Geistige Arbeit* of Nov. 5, 1934 makes one surmise that this highly regrettable waste of scholarly energy is to be attributed to a nationalistic refusal to cooperate with foreign scholars. In the interest of scholastic achievement we hope that this will remain an

isolated example of national seclusion, although our hopes have lately been exposed to very severe shocks.

F. W. KAUFMANN

*Smith College*

---

*Milton's Blindness.* By ELEANOR GERTRUDE BROWN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. 170.

Much has been written about Milton's affliction, but in this instance the author, like Milton, had bid her "eyes take holiday"; and she says in her brief preface: "On account of this bond of union, I bring to the task an interest such as Milton must have given to the writing of *Samson Agonistes*. Thus, by similarity of experience alone, I am rendered a more able critic." This little volume of 167 pages is divided into four parts: The Cause of Milton's Blindness, Autobiographical References to his Blindness, Milton as Reflected in His Poetry, and Milton's "Eyes take Holiday."

The first chapter of Part I is devoted to the description of the inadequacy of Medicine and Hygiene during the 17th Century. The following five chapters contain successively, consideration of the fantastic, improbable, and possible causes of Milton's blindness. The author concludes that either glaucoma or nearsight with detachment of the retina may have been responsible. Four chapters of Part II contain autobiographical references to Milton's affliction. Part III discusses Milton as reflected in his poetry. Part IV deals with the various aspects of Milton's blindness, and gives the most interesting analysis of the effect of blindness upon the man, his character and his writings, by one who is herself blind. This part also includes graphic descriptions of loss of sight—quoted from distinguished blind writers. The author concludes, "that Milton's blindness affected his life and poetry spiritually and philosophically. It increased his power of concentration and the acuteness of his auditory and olfactory senses; but it was not responsible for the selection of visual images in his later poetry, and did not determine his painting on a vast scale, his choice of luminous and color adjectives, nor his forgetting of certain flowers."

The final chapter is given up to the consideration of the praise and dispraise heaped upon Milton. The author says: "Perhaps no poet of the English language has received less dispraise than Milton." However, certain it is that some of his contemporaneous critics, such as Salmasius, developed the art of invective and abuse to a high degree of controversial efficiency. On the other hand, of few great men have there been spoken or written so many beautiful eulogies as of Milton.

The author concludes with the very consoling thought that all the handicapped must "find in affliction the blessing which alone makes its endurance possible; but, like Milton, learn to believe that 'They also serve who only stand and wait.'" Thus very sympathetically does Miss Brown, searching through the records of the multi-minded poet, pluck a nettle here and there, and in its place plant a flower.

WILLIAM H. WILMER

*Wilmer Ophthalmological Institute,  
The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718: A Biographical and Critical Study.* By ROBERT NEWTON CUNNINGHAM. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1933. Pp. 217.

Although Motteux is only a minor luminary in English literature, he is an undeniably interesting one. As Mr. Cunningham notes, he is remembered to-day only for his translations of Rabelais and Cervantes. But in the course of a varied literary career he did noteworthy work also in journalism, the novel, the drama, and the opera. When we remember that he came to England as a refugee at the age of twenty-two, we have reason to admire his skill in the language of his adopted land, especially his mastery of the current colloquialism which the modern reader finds so amusingly racy, although it was stylistically below the level of the best prose of the time, the prose of Dryden, Addison, and Swift.

This little volume on the life and works of Motteux is therefore welcome. The author has painstakingly gathered the facts and presented them in a straightforward manner, without either fictional elaboration or hero-worship. Nevertheless, he might have indulged in a little more art; he does not succeed in evoking for us the personality he writes about, and Motteux' place in literature remains vague even at the end of the book.

When he turns to sketching—all too slightly—the background for Motteux, Mr. Cunningham is insecure and sometimes slips into infelicitous statements. For instance, there is a curious remark that the "very existence" of Motteux' prologues and epilogues "demonstrates also that the tradition of prologue and epilogue had become firmly established" (p. 108); but we have read Dryden's prologues, at least, and find the demonstration superfluous. Motteux' "Prologue to Her Royal Highness" (1696) could not have been addressed "to the Queen" (p. 109), who had died in 1694, but must obviously have been for Princess Anne. Much more important is the confusion evident in some remarks on sentimentalism

(p. 119). Mr. Cunningham seems to imply that moral purpose, as such, has been identified by many critics with sentimentalism, and he cites *The Rape of the Lock* as evidence that an "explicit moralist" may also be acclaimed as an artist. But the ethical implications of sentimentalism, and the effect of sentimentalism on comedy and tragedy, are subjects not so easily disposed of as that; they demand more protracted study. Mr. Cunningham's informative volume might have been more illuminating had he devoted more attention to such aspects of literary history.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

*University of Michigan*

---

*The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais.* By EDNA C. FREDRICK. Bryn Mawr: 1934. Pp. 129.

Here is a book that throws new light on two problems confronting the student of French comedy. One is the development of dramatic technique that turned *L'Ecole des femmes* into *Le Barbier de Séville*. The other is the origin of the *pièce bien faite*. Linking the two there is obviously Beaumarchais, whose importance has generally been estimated hitherto somewhat as follows: "Beaumarchais, in the eighteenth century, was the first to conceive of comedy as a dramatic genre worthy and capable of technical excellence";<sup>1</sup> or again: "After Beaumarchais (who first constructed a complex and, at the same time, compact plot, nervous, brilliant and bustling), Scribe . . . utilized and developed this law of stage motion *discovered by Beaumarchais*."<sup>2</sup> Thus Beaumarchais is conceived as revolutionizing the construction of comedy by a *tour de force* of his unique genius. All too often no credit is given that other original genius, Diderot, whom Beaumarchais recognized as his master and whose theories are embodied in Beaumarchais' plays.

Not only does Miss Fredrick show, in an admirably clear analysis of Diderot's *Entretiens* and *De l'art dramatique* and the prefaces and plays of Beaumarchais, that Diderot developed and Beaumarchais put into practice the theories of plot construction which were to filter through the next forty years into nineteenth century comedy. She also undertakes to prove that Diderot's dramatic treatises and *Le Barbier de Séville* mark the culmination

<sup>1</sup> N. C. Arvin, *Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre 1815-1860*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 172. (Italics mine.)

rather than the beginning of a new conception of comedy. From the earliest years of the century, writers who were unable themselves to turn out first class plays began to criticize and theorize, foreseeing that comedy was doomed unless in some way interest could be added to the sterile imitations of Molière. There were attempts at innovation, but Marivaux' psychological studies lacked action and plot; in the *comédie larmoyante* the complicated series of mistaken identities and misunderstandings necessitated too much exposition and left too little time for action; neither the episodic *comédie à tiroirs* nor the loosely constructed scenarios of the Théâtre-Italien and the Opéra-Comique satisfied a protesting spirit that finally led such playwrights as Riccoboni and Des-touches to declare that, while the classical *comédie de caractère* was still the ideal, plot was just as important as the study of character. It is not such a startling step to Diderot's famous dictum that the conditions should determine the characters. With his amazing gift for assimilating the ideas in the air about him, and molding them into memorable and significant form, Diderot passed on to Beaumarchais and to later generations the belief that in a successful comedy *forme* should receive more attention than *fond*.

Miss Fredrick has done a solid and stimulating piece of work, which the reader compliments by regretting that she did not enlarge its scope to include the years between Beaumarchais and Scribe. She says of the evolution of comedy after Beaumarchais only that it had "gained sufficient momentum to be carried along by its own force until the advent of Scribe," (p. 2)—a statement which seems to disregard the turbulent events of that rather long interval, when the normal development of comedy was interrupted by the demand for propaganda during the Revolution and by the classical revival of the Empire.

EDITH MELCHER

Wellesley College

---

*Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert* von OTTO FUNKE. Inhalt: I. Von J. Harris bis Lord Monboddo. II. Horne Tooke als Sprachphilosoph. Bern: Francke, 1934. Pp. 162.

In his new book the Professor of English in the University of Berne has given us an account of English linguistic theories in the second half of the eighteenth century. Part of the ground was already covered by an essay on the theoretical views of J. Harris published in the author's *Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie* (Berne, 1928), but the present volume aims at giving a coherent survey of the whole field, tracing the ups and downs of two philosophical currents—a rationalism usually coupled with a ten-

dency towards materialism and an idealism embodying much of the substance of what a little later developed into Romanticism. The former trend is illustrated by the theories of J. Priestley and A. Smith, whereas the two principal representatives of the latter are J. Harris and Lord Monboddo, both of whom owe a great deal to classical antiquity. They emphasize the spiritual elements of language and delight in its aesthetic qualities—the latter feature being shared by Adam Smith to the point of giving an unexpected irrational turn to his rationalistic speculations on the nature and value of language. Comparatively much space is allotted to the views of the Frenchman De Brosses, which seem to have had a considerable influence on the philological theories of J. Horne Tooke, that staunch supporter of the cause of rationalism and in some respects the most interesting and original of the figures dealt with in Professor Funke's essay. The author gives a detailed account of his chief philological work, *The Diversions of Purley*, bringing out in vivid relief Horne Tooke's one-sided, almost maniacal, insistence on his own perverse theories as well as the great merits of his historical investigation of the concrete material of his native language. Professor Funke has succeeded in imparting an almost dramatic quality to his treatment of the struggle of different principles in the wrong-headed but remarkable work of this last of the champions of eighteenth century "enlightenment" that are discussed in this book.

The author's own point of view comes out in his critical observations on the theorists dealt with. He does not confine himself to expounding their views and showing their position in the general development of philological thought but often drops interesting remarks as to the ultimate validity of their ideas. As a pupil of the late Professor A. Marty, he refrains from those vague metaphysical speculations that mar the work of many of his continental contemporaries and colleagues. His method is empirical and his point of view psychological in the best sense of the word. Some of Professor Marty's concepts—particularly that of the "figürliche innere Sprachform"—are constantly made use of in Professor Funke's evaluations of eighteenth-century digressions from the path of truth.

The style of the book is clear and fairly lively. We are not lost in a welter of detail but are provided with definite philosophical criteria, feeling at the same time that the philosophy is that of a trained philologist whose views are based on a real knowledge of facts.

ANTS ORAS

University of Tartu, Estonia

---

*George Gissing and his Critic, Frank Swinnerton.* By RUTH CAPERS MCKAY. Pp. 112. *George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence.* By AUGUSTUS HENRY ABLE, 3RD. Pp. 140. University of Pennsylvania doctoral theses, privately printed, 1933. *The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism.* By ELISABETH SCHNEIDER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 200. \$2.00.

Tracing Gissing's influence on Swinnerton and defending the teacher against the pupil, Doctor McKay's long essay derives in large part from a fundamental illiberality in reading Swinnerton (and involves, too, pp. 40 ff., a superficiality in reading Meredith). In contrast to the literary historian, the sound critic like Swinnerton often has to treat an author from a single point of view which, because of its singleness, sometimes over- or under-states complicated matters. Such critical readings are tests by which works qualify as classics from age to age. One requires of the critic only that he be consistent in his viewpoint and that he do no violence without showing good cause to the established standing of his author. Swinnerton portrayed Gissing suitably and consistently as an egoistic failure. He did no violence to an established reputation, for he implied greatness by writing a book about Gissing and said finally no more than is true, that Gissing was a great second-rater, a failure beside first-raters like Meredith, Dickens, or Hardy. No amount of rhapsodizing recommended by Doctor McKay is likely to alter this estimate.

Doctor Able's study of Peacock and Meredith is more stimulating and to the point. To be sure, one rebels against the extent of influence Peacock is said to have had on Meredith because one knows Meredith for an individualist and one knows that parallels may derive from at least three sources: (1) direct influence from one person to another; (2) responses to *zeitgeist*, contemporary problems, similar social impulses; and (3) responses to timeless circumstances, traditions, temperaments or points of view. Shelley and Keats, for example, have much in common, not because one borrowed from the other, but because they were contemporaries, approached similar problems, and were never entirely outside the Platonic tradition in solving them. Meredith and Peacock, similarly, belonged to one caste, and met similar social problems. They both adopted a comic point of view. If they had not known each other, therefore, one would still expect to find parallels between their works as well as parallels to the works of others likewise dominated by the Comic Spirit, from Lucian, Erasmus, Jonson, Fielding, and even Carlyle to James Barrie or James Stephens. Peacock's main function in Meredith's life was probably only that

of helping a point of view to crystallize. As for making the Comic Spirit a Muse or Divinity—after all, it sat with Lucian on the orb of the moon overlooking Vanity Fair or the *comédie humaine* or the tragic comedy or whatever one wants to call the human show. Yet though Doctor Able's study lacks this background, it is suggestive and informative, especially in Chapters III and IV, "An Aspect of the Comic Spirit" and "Sentimentalism and its Cure."

The process of making a philosopher out of a good critic has precedent no doubt, but it becomes slightly ridiculous when it leads Doctor Schneider to rank Hazlitt as philosopher above Coleridge, Johnson, Carlyle, Arnold, Ruskin, Pater, and others, though she insists at the same time that Hazlitt distrusted philosophical systems and was an opportunistic, somewhat Menckonian critic, not creative. Doctor Schneider's book, nevertheless, is a valuable addition to Hazlitt scholarship. It is mature. Its author has a humanist's knack for detecting connections between ideas and arriving at unities. In her book one can readily find the common notions of Hazlitt on aesthetic matters, stimulating comparisons between him and Coleridge or Schiller, and finally a list of Hazlitt's readings in philosophy. Somehow, in spite of her thesis, a picture emerges of Hazlitt as a critic whose views have a kind of consistency, not because he was a logician, but because they were strained through a single creature, Hazlitt, who was fairly up in aesthetics, who was at his best in illuminating works as they came before him and stimulated him, and whose criticisms therefore had something of the mellowing and spiring effect of aging literature in a vigorous, distinguished individuality.

ARTHUR E. DuBOIS

*Duquesne University*

---

*Walt Whitman in England.* By HAROLD BLODGETT. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1934. Pp. ix + 234. (Cornell Studies in English, XXIV.)

*Walt Whitman.* By FLOYD STOVALL. New York: American Book Company, 1934. Pp. lxiii + 426. (American Writers Series.)

Mr. Blodgett's *Walt Whitman in England* is a study of the interest in Whitman which developed in the British Isles before the poet's death in 1892, arranged "according to the various Englishmen who responded actively to *Leaves of Grass*." Naturally those who responded most actively were Whitman's defenders; and, accordingly, this study tends to stress the favorable interest rather than the unfavorable, leaving the impression that the response to *Leaves of Grass* was predominantly generous and understanding.



The facts given show that this was not altogether true, but their presentation would have been clearer had the concluding chapter been a chronological survey of the attitudes displayed toward Whitman's successive publications. It is to be hoped that the author will take advantage of his unique command of a large body of interesting material and publish an additional essay concerned primarily with the criticism not associated with outstanding individuals. Except for the omission of something of this sort, Mr. Blodgett's survey seems admirably thorough. It is instructive and readable, and it will serve future students as an invaluable descriptive bibliography of the most important English contemporary comment on Whitman. An extensive formal bibliography including numerous periodical articles not elsewhere listed is included in the volume, but it is not complete and may be supplemented from *Poole's Index*.

A few minor errors survived proof reading: the reference to Grindrod as a Civil War veteran in 1856 (p. 16); the application of "until recently no one" to the facts given (p. 154); and the misprint of 1892 for 1882 as the date of Ellis's "Two Worlds" essay (p. 209). In the bibliography, xlii, 176-176, for xlviii, 170-176 (p. 233, Swinbune's "Whitmania") and xlii for xlviii (p. 233, Symonds' reply).

Mr. Stovall's book is an anthology of selections from Whitman's poetry and prose with brief notes; a chronological table; a selected bibliography; and an introduction giving a concise account of his background, life, and work, and an exposition of his theory of poetry and principal lines of thought. The editor's work appears careful and his ideas sound, but the expository portion of the introduction has two serious faults. In the first place, parts of it are written in a style almost as inflated and difficult as Whitman's own and consequently are of doubtful value to the beginning student for whom they are intended. In the second, its tone and mechanics of reference are those of an essay defending an interpretation rather than those of an introduction to a particular body of selections. Since the interpretation is not new, this volume is of little interest to advanced students; nor is it a wholly satisfactory text for beginners.

LEON HOWARD

*Pomona College*

*Patmore: a Study in Poetry.* By FREDERICK PAGE. [N. Y. and] London: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. 184. \$2.25.

Mr. Page has been for more than twenty years a student of his subject, and is already known by valuable selections from Patmore's unprinted periodical essays (*Courage in Politics*, etc., with a

complete bibliography, 1921). Mr. Osbert Burdett's *Idea of Coventry Patmore* (1921) provided only a substitute for acquaintance with the system implicit in the poems, but Mr. Page now vindicates their visionary mood afresh for the reader from a closer familiarity with both Patmore's life and times and with his prose works and unpublished notebooks. His main task is professedly to determine the value of *The Angel in the House* and the earlier poems and of the metrical theory involved in *The Unknown Eros*, and incidentally to decide whether Patmore's 'nobly wild' mysticism deserves recognition from something more than 'a Roman Catholic coterie.' The book is uncritical, occupied rather with the poet's aims than his performance, but its riches will be essential to further investigators.

Without detailed aesthetic criticism one is surprised to hear in the course of only three pages (14-16) that Patmore captures (in isolated lines) the *note* of Milton, Pope, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Arnold or Swinburne, and that as a man of letters he has frequently 'the advantage over' Milton, Johnson, Scott, Wordsworth, Lamb or Carlyle. Allusion, which is all that Mr. Page pretends to, is not criticism, and it becomes preposterous when he makes small difference between Patmore's absorption, as a 'disciple,' in the established orders of Victorian society and of Roman theology, and the poetical aims of the two 'heresiarchs' whom he most often invokes as 'disciples' for comparison, namely Dante and Wordsworth. The 'capacity of elaborate social beauty' of Patmore's feminine divinity is not comparable with the spirit of philosophical poems conceived in ages when a more virile social and political philosophy was in the air.

Chronological arrangement gives Mr. Page the felicitous use of his biographical and historical facts, but he has no criteria for poetry beyond Patmore's own principles, wilfully applied in season and out of season to special cases. The accounting for the sources of *The Angel in the House* is skilful and original; in the end (pp. 79-80) they are not much more than comparisons. *The Unknown Eros* is again the occasion for really good literary investigation, but to regard the sexual mysticism of the author of the *Sponsa Dei* as mystical theology, even if the converse must so often be true, is hardly necessary at this date. Patmore's theological spirit lusts far too often against the poet's flesh, and Mr. Page is elsewhere only too zealous to talk boldly about 'sensuality' and ardour for 'the visible world' (pp. 26, 61, 174-8). His original and stimulating account of *The Marriage of the Blessed Virgin* (extant only in MS. notes) describes 'perfect humanity, verging upon, but never entering, the breathless region of Divinity.' The poet must here, as often in this exposition, remain the property of his coreligionists rather than of literary criticism: he believed as his critic does that 'true poetry and true theological science have to do with one and the same ideal.'

The discussion of the theory and practice of Patmore's irregular ode deals primarily with the element of pause (which he held to be a chief subject of metrical law), with the rightness of the 'dipode' as a unit of verse and with 'that artistic consciousness to the expression of which Hegel traces the very life of metre.' Mr. Page 'discovers the Time of each word by the sense of Passion,' and it is only unfortunate that his tentative transcription in tonic sol-fa notation should falsify the poet's intention. There is a curious piece of logic on pp. 156-7 in a passage already revealing the author's inaptitude for aesthetic exegesis. His overgenerous championship cannot settle Patmore's reputation. There is still need for an historical elucidation of the devout regard which Patmore had for poetry (with such a background of contemporary thought as Mr. Page begins to trace in his account of 'the poem of the age' that Patmore was to have written) and for a more complete alignment of his mature poetry, by its elliptical conceits and emotional rhetoric, with the technique of the Metaphysicals.

Princeton, New Jersey

OWEN E. HOLLOWAY

*Letters to the New Island.* By WILLIAM BUTLER YEATS. Edited by HORACE REYNOLDS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 222. \$2.50.

This book is an important contribution to the history of the Irish Renaissance, for it throws new light upon the origin and development of the ideas of its founder and chief poet. Mr. Horace Reynolds has discovered in the files of the *Boston Pilot* and the *Providence Journal* nineteen articles long forgotten even by the writer himself, which Yeats wrote between 1888 and 1892 to inform American readers about the beginnings of the literary revival in Ireland.

The most remarkable aspect of these essays is their prophetic character. As Yeats says in a prefatory note, they show that "I had in later life worked out with the excitement of discovery things known in my youth as though one forgot and rediscovered oneself." Again and again we come upon beacons to direct the progress of the movement ten years before the Irish Dramatic Movement began. "With Irish literature and Irish thought alone I have to do." "From that great candle of the past we must all light our little tapers." "England is old and her poets must scrape up the crumbs of an almost finished banquet, but Ireland has still full tables." "If we can but put those tumultuous centuries into tale or drama, the whole world will listen to us and sit at our feet like children who hear a new story."

In an illuminating Introduction Mr. Reynolds discusses with thoroughness the five major beliefs which the young Yeats an-

nounced as his programme: (1) An Irish writer should be national and write of Irish life, (2) The treasury of Irish legend should be unlocked for Irish reader and writer alike, (3) Irish poetry must be purged of politics, (4) The study of the occult would free man from the despotism of unhappiness, (5) After Ireland had an imaginative literature she would be ripe for a national theatre.

Mr. Reynolds has done a great service in making these articles available and in explaining their significance so brilliantly. Yeats writes, "These essays, which I have not seen for years, fill me with curiosity." That is the feeling of all readers interested in the Celtic Revival who open this volume.

F. W. C. HERSEY

Harvard University

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*Les Romantiques français et la Musique.* Par RAYMOND LESLIE EVANS. Paris: Champion, 1934. Pp. xiii + 184. Après le petit livre vivant et senti de M. Baldensperger, *Sensibilité musicale et Romantisme* (Paris, 1925), voici une étude plus ambitieuse d'apparence, mais qui est encore loin d'être définitive. L'auteur a fort bien vu les principales divisions du sujet, il a tracé des cadres plausibles, mais sa documentation paraît trop courte et trop souvent de seconde main. Les quelques pages consacrées à George Sand qu'il aurait autant valu ne pas qualifier de "géante à forme de Titan" sont manifestement insuffisantes (pp. 66-74), et nous aurions voulu voir l'historien suivre de plus près l'admiratrice de Liszt et l'amie de Chopin "à travers ses romans musicaux," qui sont seulement énumérés et trop brièvement caractérisés. Plus graves encore sont les lacunes que l'on pourrait relever dans l'étude sur Balzac (pp. 74-85). Après M. Rouchès et M. Bellaigue, M. Evans s'est attaché surtout à *Gambara* et à *Massimilla Doni*. Mais comment parler du culte de Balzac pour Beethoven sans mentionner au moins la page prestigieuse par laquelle se termine *César Birotteau*, et comment peut-on oublier le bon Schmucke, l'ami du *Cousin Pons*? La seconde partie du travail de M. Evans est plus neuve et plus fouillée. On lira avec intérêt les courts chapitres sur le "primitivisme" musical qu'après M. Baldensperger il a relevé chez Madame de Staël, Chateaubriand, Balzac, Gérard de Nerval et George Sand. L'auteur a justement noté que ce primitivisme est aussi un exotisme et que les romantiques ont recherché les barcaroles des gondoliers, les chants du Tyrol autant que les chants des paysans de France. Goût de l'exotisme et en particulier de l'italianisme, des virtuoses du chant et du piano, recherche d'une émotion musicale qui fait rêver, secoue et fait vibrer les nerfs et

dont l'appel est sensuel, confusion extrême des arts, et aspiration plus ou moins raisonnée vers un art complet qui combinerait à la fois la pensée, la forme, la couleur et les sons, telles sont les aspirations, les ambitions qui semblent avoir troublé et inquiété les romantiques. Il n'en est pas moins vrai que par instants, certains, et Balzac est de ceux-là, comme le montre très justement M. Evans, ont eu l'idée d'un art où il n'y aurait "ni figures ni sentiments" et qui serait de l'art pur, ou plutôt de la musique pure.

GILBERT CHINARD

---

*Contes de fées du Grand Siècle.* Par MARY ELIZABETH STORER. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1934. Pp. 182. \$1.75. This is an edition of nine fairy-tales composed at the end of the seventeenth century, or early in the eighteenth, by Mme d'Aulnoy (*Mouton, Grenouille bienfaisante*), Catherine Bernard (*Riquet à la houppe*), Mme de Murat (*Palais de la vengeance, Fée princesse, Peine perdue*), Mlle de la Force (*Vert et bleu, Persinette*), and the Chevalier de Mailly (*la Reine de l'île des Fleurs*). *La Fée princesse* and *Peine perdue* had not previously been published. The texts seem to have been carefully reproduced and are accompanied by a short account of the *genre* and by notices of the authors. The only misprint that may mislead a reader is 1687, apparently for 1697, on p. 77. The author raises the question as to whether *Riquet à la houppe* is by Mlle Bernard or Eustache Le Noble. Her argument is well presented, but I do not find any justification for her assigning the tale to both of them, however equitable this may seem. It would have been well to point out on p. 8 that Mother Goose had been already mentioned by Régnier; to indicate as a partial source for *le Mouton* the *Innocence reconnue*<sup>1</sup> of Cériziers; and to mention the fact that the cure for blindness in *Persinette* had appeared in *l'Aveugle de Smyrne*. These are minor details that detract little from the usefulness of this pleasing volume, which will be of interest to all concerned with the history of modern *contes*.

H. C. L.

---

*The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction.* By EMILE CAILLIET. English translation by Lorraine Havens. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1932. Pp. 229. 40 fr. Few men possess the qualifications for writing such a book as

<sup>1</sup> In both stories a woman is condemned to death, sent into a forest, and set free; a dog's tongue is shown as a substitute for hers in order to make it appear that she has been killed; she is assisted by sympathetic animals and finally restored to her home. The story goes back to the Middle Ages, but Cériziers's account of it is nearest to that of Mme d'Aulnoy and was easily accessible, for *l'Innocence reconnue* passed through at least five editions in the seventeenth century.

this. The task requires not merely a knowledge of the fiction under discussion, but an understanding as well of strange aspects of humanity, an understanding based upon close acquaintance with the primitive mind. Dr. Cailliet, Professor of French Literature and Civilization in Scripps College, has for many years delved deeply into the history of the primitive and the occult. In 1926 he went to Madagascar to pursue a social study of the natives. He lived among them, acquired their languages, became acquainted at first hand with their mental processes. Upon a second visit he was awarded the official "Brevet" of Malagasy dialects.

To the study of literature he brings, therefore, the mind of a scientist and a philosopher. His extensive learning and his kindly tolerance illuminate that portion of French fiction of the nineteenth century which concerns itself with magic. "It is one of our firmest convictions," he writes in the preface, "that literary criticism, having already become enriched by contact with many scientific disciplines, may find a source of new possibilities in the teachings of contemporary ethnology." In the spirit of this conviction he discusses in turn (1) the tradition of the popular novel and the *genre* of terror, (2) the *merveilleux* in fairy tales and short stories of wonder, (3) magic of the past and the historical novel, (4) occultism and the philosophical novel, (5) the novel of the supernatural from animal magnetism to modern spiritualism, (6) the metamorphoses of the Devil in the nineteenth century and Huysmans's satanism, (7) sorcery among the peasants and the novel of country life, and finally (8) magic among the "savages" and the exotic novel. He makes clear that, only since scientific knowledge of the primitive mind has made possible faithful treatment, have the various themes of magic been capable of development into literary masterpieces. He has isolated the themes, shown why they have become popular, and furnished a background for a proper understanding and appreciation of such fiction. He has, indeed, provided an adequate foundation for further study in this field. The English translation, while clear, does not always rise above the influence of the French idiom.

WALDO H. DUNN

College of Wooster

---

*The Congo, Parts 1 and 2; Part 3, and Kansas; John L. Sullivan.* By VACHEL LINDSAY. Columbia University Phonograph Records, Nos. 1, 2, 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933. \$.75 for each record; \$2.00 for the set of three. In the introduction to the *Selected Poems*, published early in 1931, I said that "phonograph records of every poem in this book, exactly as Mr. Lindsay chants it, ought to be made and be made at once." A few weeks later the poet walked into the speech

laboratory of Professor Cabell Greet, who rose magnificently to a great opportunity; and more than half the poems of that volume were recorded. Before the year was out the singer was dead. In the library of Columbia University now reposes a complete set of the master records. Public response to the first three issues will, it is hoped, warrant speedy publication of the rest; since, if I may quote again from the same essay, "for most of us the melodic phrases of 'The Chinese Nightingale' never rise from the cold type. One must hear the poet himself if one is to appreciate the ravishing beauty and variety of its patterns." The importance, therefore, to our national art of the enlightened action of Mr. Greet and the Columbia Press is obvious, whether or not one is prepared to accept Mr. Edgar Lee Masters's recent appraisal of Lindsay's best work as "the largest body of inspired lyricism that any American has contributed." As for the quality of these first records, they are made of a flexible composition, which can be manufactured cheaply. They are a little scratchy, and those who are not well acquainted with Lindsay's poetry will need to hold the book for the first few playings. But the voice and, more surprisingly, the vibrant personality come through superbly. The vocal orchestration of "The Congo" surpasses any performance I heard directly. "Kansas," that fine lyric of the wheat harvest, was well chosen to illustrate the non-rhetorical side of Lindsay's art. "John L. Sullivan" is a good example of his less serious vein and, even within itself, of the wonderfully wide range that ran the whole gamut from tenderness to giant humor.

H. S.

---

*Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Idea of the Infinity of the Universe in 1576.* By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON and SANFORD V. LARKEY. Huntington Library Bulletin, No. 5, April 1934, pp. 69-117. As hitherto disregarded but significant evidence for Digges' prominence in the history of ideas and of cosmological theories especially in England, the authors present a reduced facsimile of Digges' diagram of the universe on the Copernican System together with a reprint (pp. 79-95) of that part of the rare 1576 edition of his *Prognostication Everlastinge* in which Digges upholds that system. The article makes clear Digges' priority over Giordano Bruno in developing in England the idea of an infinite universe and in supporting this idea by definitely scientific reasoning and observation rather than by metaphysical speculation. Valuable both for the reprint and for the scholarly discussion accompanied by bibliographical, historical and scientific detail.

DOROTHY STIMSON

Goucher College

*Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry.* By HENRY CECIL WYLD. Three Lectures Delivered Before the University of London during February 1933 at Westfield College. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1933. Pp. 72. 2s. 6d. Professor H. C. Wyld admits, in the last of these lectures that one of the tasks of a philologist is to relate the earlier to the later stages of a language. This task he performs with characteristic neatness in his examination of words from the four categories into which the poet's vocabulary "naturally" falls: 1. Words common to poetry and prose, 2. Common words well used, 3. Words not used in ordinary prose and 4. Words "unsuited to serious poetry, which nevertheless are sometimes used." Having made these distinctions Professor Wyld permits his interest in etymology to distract his attention from the categories themselves even though the differences between the first two might well repay philological scrutiny. The second part, "Poetry and Change" (the lectures are not printed as delivered), given largely to a discussion of "'the pretentious trick of calling things out of their right names,'" raises still more interesting questions of linguistic function. Unfortunately the questions are not pursued. Differences of opinion on matters of propriety are inevitable: If Dryden was thinking of Hamlet I, 1, 107, the objection to his "rummage" (Ann. Mir. 208) as "inexcusably prosaic" might be modified. Hawes' "pulchrytude" has become part of American journalese; American readers may detest it for other reasons than those advanced by Professor Wyld. The spelling and pointing of the lines quoted is no more capricious than might be expected in a printed lecture.

R. D. JAMESON

*National Tsing Hua University, Peiping, China*

*Ralph Waldo Emerson: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes.* By FREDERIC I. CARPENTER. New York: American Book Company, [1934]. Pp. lviii + 456. In the same series (American Writers Series, Harry Hayden Clark, General Editor): *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, by AUSTIN WARREN, pp. cxii + 368; *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, by ODELL SHEPARD, pp. lxiv + 372. This attractively gotten up series, which is to be considerably extended, opens well. The handy little volumes are easy to read and large enough to represent the authors adequately. A useful feature is the select critical bibliographies. The introductions are not perfunctory but thoughtful.

H. S.



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

NOVEMBER, 1935

Number 7

---

## L'ART DE RÉGNER IN XVIIITH CENTURY FRENCH TRAGEDY

In XVIIth century French writings a king is generally credited with motives attesting that, great as the potentate appears, greater still is the man in him; appraisals of contemporary monarchs concur: the surname of "le Juste" given to Louis XIII, La Motte's tribute to Louis XIV,

. . . pour t'admirer j'envisage  
Tes vertus plus que tes exploits . . .  
. . . respectant les limites  
Que te prescrivait l'Équité,  
Cent fois à ces bornes prescrites  
Ton courage s'est arrêté.<sup>1</sup>

In tragedy, however, the office of king ordinarily subjugates the man: initiative is often dictated by the claims of practical politics; good faith, discretion, integrity are commonly ruled by the *maximes d'État* which measure the discipline of the profession,

La justice n'est pas une vertu d'État . . .  
La timide équité détruit l'art de régner,<sup>2</sup>  
La foi ne doit point faire un esclave d'un Roi;  
Aux besoins de l'État cette chimère cède,<sup>3</sup>  
. . . quelque grand que soit un potentat,  
Il n'est pas à lui-même, il est à son État.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *La Sagesse du Roi Supérieure à tous les événements* (Œuvres, Paris, Prault, 1754, I, 143-144). See dedication of Racine's *Alexandre, Discours Prononcé à la Tête du Clergé par M. L'Abbé Colbert*, 1685. Cf. L. Batiffol, *Richelieu et le Roi Louis XIII*, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1934, pp. 75, 83; D. Mornet, *Les Origines Intellectuelles de la Révolution Française*, Paris, Colin, 1933, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Corneille, *Pompée*, 1643, I, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Mme Deshoulières, *Genséric*, 1680, II, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Le Clerc, *Iphigénie*, 1675, I, 2.

The prince who deteriorates in office is found in classical sources. Leaving aside the imitators of Ulysses who turn instinctively to trickery, it may still be said that the kings of Greek drama yield readily to political impulses. Royal power puts upon them a stamp which can be emphasized by contrasts within or without the individual. In Sophocles, the bluster of King Œdipus is stressed by the ingenuousness of Creon;<sup>5</sup> and later, King Creon's overbearing conduct stands out against his own pre-regal mien and Haemon's discretion.<sup>6</sup> Agamemnon deplores the yoke of power,<sup>7</sup> bemoans the fact that opinion silences justice;<sup>8</sup> and illustrates the bondage of his position in denying Hecuba's claim against her son's murderer,

This very man the host account their friend,  
The dead their foe: that dear he is to thee  
Is nought to them . . .

in me thou hast one fain  
To share thy toil, and swift to lend thee aid,  
But slow to face Achaeans' murmurings.<sup>9</sup>

D'Aubignac saw in the disparaging of ancient kings an homage to a democratic Athens; he cautioned his confrères that the French, who respected and loved their kings, would not allow "que les Roys puissent estre meschans."<sup>10</sup> The drama must, he insisted, "enseigner des choses qui . . . montrent toujours les Souverains comme des objets de vénération, environnés des vertus . . . et soutenus de la main de Dieu, qui ne les défend pas moins des grands crimes que des grands malheurs."<sup>11</sup>

The warning was tardy and futile. Plays of the preceding hun-

<sup>5</sup> *Œdipus Tyrannus*, Oxford Trans., New York, 1879, 22.

<sup>6</sup> *Antigone*, Oxford Trans., ed. cit., 183 *et seq.*

<sup>7</sup> Euripides, *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, Loeb Classical Library, New York, 1916, *Euripides*, I, 9.

<sup>8</sup> Sophocles, *Ajax*, Oxford Trans., ed. cit., 282.

<sup>9</sup> Euripides, *Hecuba*, Loeb Cl. Lib., ed. cit., *Euripides*, I, 315.

<sup>10</sup> *La Pratique du Théâtre*, 1657, ed. Martino, Paris, Champion, 1927, 73.

<sup>11</sup> *Troisième Dissertation concernant le Poème Dramatique*; cf. *Recueil de Dissertations sur plusieurs Tragédies* . . . , Granet, Paris, 1740, II, 33. Fact is no argument: ". . . quand la vérité répugne à la générosité, à l'honnêteté . . . de la Scène, il faut que [le poète] l'abandonne, et qu'il prenne le vraisemblable pour faire un beau poème, au lieu d'une méchante histoire" (*op. cit.*, I, 147). Again: ". . . quand on met sur notre théâtre des exemples de la mauvaise fortune (des rois) . . . il en faut retrancher toutes les circonstances qui peuvent faire mal penser de leur conduite" (*Id.*, II, 33).

dred years had familiarized the French audiences with the lèse-majesté of the theater; and the professional deformation of kings was to be more and more utilized by the dramatists throughout the century. The stage had already discounted God's guardianship over a luckless Sedecie,

. . . pourquoi

Me fait-il torturer par un pire que moy? <sup>12</sup>

and God's influence over a tormented Saul,

Oh! la belle façon d'aller ainsi chercher

Les hommes pour après les faire trebucher.<sup>13</sup>

Kings' principles had been derided as pawns in a game of politics. Gratitude is brushed aside by suspicion. The Saul of Des Masures turns against his benefactor David at the first show of the latter's popularity,

Que reste-il désormais à ceste gent meschante

Que de l'auoir pour Roy . . .<sup>14</sup>

Justice is supplanted by policy. Agesilas vouches satisfaction to a peasant whose daughters were murdered by noblemen. However, the peasant must produce the culprits, and the king's counselors oppose his petition for aid,

Sur la delation du meurtre de tes filles,

Nous ne devons fletir l'honneur de deux familles.<sup>15</sup>

The peasant's witnesses are heard, and the counselors impugn the testimony. The king reverts to his assurances, and when the peasant denounces

pareille remise

Grace à ces assassins execrables promise,<sup>16</sup>

he is ousted by the counselors. Thus is justified the boast of the criminals,

Nous dans Sparte premiers, d'illustre parentage,

Craindre ce paysan? <sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Garnier, *les Juives*, v. The other king of the play, Nebuchadnezzar, is exhibited as a "roy carnacier."

<sup>13</sup> Jean de La Taille, *Saul Furieux*, iv.

<sup>14</sup> *David Triomphant* (Ed. Société des Textes Français Modernes, Paris, Cornély, 1907), 162. The fact that the demonstration is a trick of the devil (ed. cit., 130-132, 143-145) does not vindicate a watchful Providence.

<sup>15</sup> Hardy, *Scédase* (1605-1615), v.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, iii.

Integrity is swayed by opportunism. Priam welcomes Achilles's love for Polixene as a promise of peace. His sons advise that the Greek hero be lured with a message of approval and be put to death. Priam, the king, concedes the merit of the *coup*,

. . . il faut l'appaster, l'allecher,  
Et puis d'un saut mortel le faire trebucher.<sup>18</sup>

Priam, the man, is beset with scruples,

Inviolable foy, rare ornement des Rois,  
Que te gardant ne puis-je arrester à mon choix?  
La foy sur les vertus pare vne Royauté,<sup>19</sup>

but his protestations are refuted as

Discours mal assortis à la bouche d'un Roy.<sup>20</sup>

Priam leaves to other hands the execution of the deed which he condones, and he departs with an appeal for commiseration,

Allez contre mon gré, un meurtre ie permets . . .  
Seul ie vay deuorer mon angoisse profonde.<sup>21</sup>

Montchrestien's *Reine d'Escoce* (pub. 1604) substitutes for the more or less private purpose of the sovereign the "bien de la patrie."<sup>22</sup> Queen Elizabeth is asked to disregard "le droit des Gens et de Nature" in judging Queen Mary. She resists the entreaty,

A dire vray, sa vie importe à nostre Estat,  
Mais la faire mourir c'est un grand attentat (II);

but the State prevails.

As in the preceding case the sovereign has no playing part in the act which she authorizes; her last words on the stage are to reassure herself that she will find a way to oppose it,

Ie rompray cependant le coup de l'entreprise (II).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Hardy, *la Mort d'Achille* (1605-1615), II, 1.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, II, 1; IV, 1.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*, IV, 1.

<sup>21</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>22</sup> The notion occurs before (cf. Garnier, *la Troade*, 1578, III); but Montchrestien is, I believe, the first to exploit it.

<sup>23</sup> The absence of the queen in the last three acts is the more striking since her struggle with the State's claim is the sole intrigue in the play.

A sympathetic exit for the monarch, an effort to separate him from the crime which he allows or commands will be a feature of the theatrical *art de régner*.<sup>24</sup> The most frequent token of the dramatist's solicitude is the early withdrawal of the king from the stage. In the works following I shall point out the cases in which he remains to the end of the play.

In the four plays just cited — Saul duped by the devil, Agésilas and Priam dominated by advisers, Elizabeth governed by State policy — the monarch's will is not his own. Later plays shift the initiative to the king. Du Ryer's *Alcionée* (1637) exemplifies the new procedure. Alcionée overthrew a king, and re-established him after obtaining the hand of his daughter. Once restored the king repudiates his word,

. . . de cette promesse autrefois nécessaire,  
N'attendez point d'effet qui ne vous soit contraire.  
Pour le bien de l'estat ayant sçeu l'auancer,  
Pour le bien de l'estat ie puis m'en dispenser (II, 3).<sup>25</sup>

He does not fail to appreciate the "grand cœur" of Alcionée, but

les thrones sont des Cieux  
Où ne doivent monter que des Rois ou des Dieux (II, 3).

He consents to leave the decision to the princess, thus sharing with her the prerogative of evasion,

. . . ie l'ay fait seulement  
Pour vous voir résister à ce consentement (III, 4).

The king needs the support of his daughter and his courtiers (Lancaster), and requires prompting in his later move against Alcionée; but he does not lack eagerness to perform his duty. It is the better to mark the sternness of the king's responsibility that the dramatist has put in the mouth of Alcionée's friend the first hint of what is to come,

S'il sçait l'art de régner, il vous arrêtera (IV, 3).<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Cf. my article, "The Shifting of Responsibility in XVIIth Century French Tragic Drama," *MLN.*, XLIX, 3, 152-158.

<sup>25</sup> The "tiltre de iuste" given to the king — perhaps an allusion to Louis XIII (Lancaster) — is not for the stage a brevet of probity. Du Ryer's *Oléomédon* (1634-1636) contains another example of breach of promise.

<sup>26</sup> Luckily Alcionée kills himself, and the king is spared a further test in "la sublime science des Rois."

Many kings of the Cornelian period could be arraigned for misdeeds of the *art de régner*; a few examples from the plays of Corneille himself suffice to test the servitude of the "souveraine raison des souverains."<sup>27</sup>

Corneille exploits the weakness of kings rather than their fortitude. He outdoes the Greeks. In his *Médée* (1635), for example, Creon, whom Euripides shielded against Medea's recriminations, is now subjected to grave charges. Seneca set a precedent, but Corneille goes farther in exposing — with corroboration for Medea's word — the breach of promise (I, 1), the trading of a refugee against the alliance of a neighbor (II, 2).<sup>28</sup> In *Pompée* (1643) there is a contrast between two codes of leadership: the faith that kings have that within

Qui dessous leur vertu *range* leurs passions (II, 1),

and the experience that a king

Balance le pouvoir et non pas les raisons (I, 1).

Between the two doctrines moves a king imagined for the occasion (his age was raised "afin que . . . portant le titre de roi, il tâchât d'en soutenir le caractère"<sup>29</sup>). Having to choose "bien des périls ou beaucoup d'infamie," Ptolemy lets himself be guided by "le bien de l'État" into the safer course of servility before the Roman Cæsar.<sup>30</sup>

Corneille's admiration for Rome cooled toward the middle of his career, and in *Nicomède* (1650-1651) he undertook to humiliate the object of his previous worship (Geoffroy). But the poet's change of heart did not benefit King Prusias, whose submission to a shameless Rome exemplifies all the better

quel attentat

Font sur le bien public les maximes d'État (III, 2).<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Corneille, *Tite et Bérénice*, v, 4.

<sup>28</sup> Self-interest is stronger than good faith in enabling him to risk war (II, 3).

<sup>29</sup> Corneille, *Examen de Pompée*.

<sup>30</sup> Ptolemy is the same sort of king in Gillet de la Tessonerie's *Art de Régner*, III (pub. 1645), only "more hesitant" (Lancaster). A precedent is found in the Massinissa of Mairet's *Sophonisbe* (1634).

<sup>31</sup> Prusias remains in the play till the end; his presence serves to bolster up the apotheosis of Nicomède.

At the same time Corneille also commended a king for his integrity. There again, he did no service to kings in general, for the king whom he exalts is not one born and bred to the manner of kings, but a self-made king. The conqueror Grimoald (*Pertharite*, 1651) holds a singular conception of his office,

Le pouvoir absolu n'a rien de redoutable  
Dont à sa conscience un roi ne soit comptable (II, 3).

The tranquillity of the State demands that he declare the returned ex-king Pertharite an impostor and quietly do away with him,

Si je pense régner, sa mort m'est nécessaire (v, 2).

Pertharite himself, with the instinct of a former king, acknowledges the justice of his doom,

Ma mort pour Grimoald ne peut avoir de crime:  
Le soin de s'affermir lui rend tout légitime (iv, 5).

But the usurper does not hesitate. He explains, as he surrenders the throne, that he feigned to believe Pertharite an impostor in order to save him,

Des maximes d'état j'ai voulu t'affranchir,  
Et ne voir pas ma gloire indignement trahie  
Par la nécessité de m'immoler ta vie (v, 5).

The failure of an upstart to comply with the requisites of his borrowed profession can only enhance the dependability of the true-born king;<sup>32</sup> thus *Pertharite* may serve as a prologue to *Suréna*.

Suréna carries a step farther "la defiance qui n'abandonne point la supresme puissance" (Du Ryer). King Orode is perturbed over his indebtedness to Suréna for reinstating him on his throne,

Un service au-dessus de toute récompense  
A force d'obliger tient presque lieu d'offense (III, 1).

Suréna's services and character cannot allay the fear

Qu'il n'ose quelque jour s'en payer par ses mains (*Ib.*).

---

<sup>32</sup> In Corneille's *Héraclius* (1647) the parvenu king had observed the tradition,

. . . j'ai mis au tombeau, pour régner sans effroi,  
Tout ce que j'en ai vu de plus digne que moi (I, 1).

"La saine politique" prescribes:

Ou faites-le périr, ou faites-en un gendre (*Ib.*);

and Suréna declines the proposal of marriage.<sup>33</sup> Orode repels the idea of destroying a friend,

que tout l'état perisse . . .  
 Avant que je défère à ces raisons d'état  
 Qui nommeroient justice un si lâche attentat (*Ib.*);

but his uneasiness grows. The intercession of a friend of Suréna,

. . . perdre Surena, c'est livrer aux Romains  
 Un sceptre que son bras a remis en vos mains (v, 1),

determines the king to "obéir à la nécessité."<sup>34</sup>

In the second half of the century the *art de régner* is variously interpreted. Racine makes the observance of a prejudice a test of Titus's fitness,

Maintiendrai-je des lois que je ne puis garder?<sup>35</sup>

The diplomacy of Pyrrhus's surrendering the son of Andromache draws the comment:

C'est acheter la paix du sang d'un malheureux.<sup>36</sup>

The solicitude of Narcissus for Nero's prestige,

Tant de précaution affoiblit votre règne,<sup>37</sup>

is obvious scoundrelism.

In *Iphigénie* Racine makes the contention of king and man more obstinate and searching than it has been heretofore, in this or any other theme. Euripides's Agamemnon was quickly brought to silence his paternal feeling by the realization of his helplessness. Rotrou's Agamemnon needed but little coaxing to surrender to his own ambition. Racine's Agamemnon is thoroughly harassed by his conflicting concerns; and if in the end the king wins, it is the victory of a bewildered king over a devastated man.

Agamemnon is proud to say that he first refused the sacrifice

<sup>33</sup> He submits that a marriage between the princess and himself would cause embarrassment to both (III, 2).

<sup>34</sup> In *Iphigénie*, a few months previously, Racine used a tactless intercession to insure the victory of the *raison d'état*.

<sup>35</sup> *Bérénice*, IV, 5.

<sup>36</sup> *Andromaque*, II, 4.

<sup>37</sup> *Britannicus*, IV, 4.



demanded of him. He yielded, however, before the alternative pictured by Ulysses,

Il me représenta l'honneur et la patrie . . .  
De quel front, immolant<sup>38</sup> tout l'état à ma fille,  
Roi sans gloire, j'irois vieillir dans ma famille (I, 1).

He now maneuvers to evade his pledge. His scheme having miscarried, he again undertakes to fulfill his duty to the State. But he is moved to humanity by the cries of Clytemnestra, and the resignation of Iphigeneia disarms him. Then he is recalled to his official interest by the intervention of Achilles,

Ma fille toute seule étoit plus redoutable.  
Ton insolent amour qui croit m'épouvanter,  
Vient de hâter le coup que tu veux arrêter . . .  
Ma gloire intéressée emporte la balance (IV, 7).

He conceives a plan to discipline Achilles without surrendering Iphigeneia,

Il l'aime, elle vivra pour un autre que lui (IV, 8).

He will seek delay. . . . Fortunately for all involved, the matter is taken out of his hands. Achilles hinders the sacrifice, and the dazed Agamemnon, who does not dare to uphold the rebel,

Le triste Agamemnon, qui n'ose l'avouer,  
Pour détourner ses yeux des meurtres qu'il présume  
Ou pour cacher ses pleurs, s'est voilé le visage (V, 5).<sup>39</sup>

The foregoing synopses suffice to show that in the matter of kings the XVIIIth century theater does not disagree with Voltaire's lines:

Un roi pour ses sujets est un dieu qu'on révère,  
Pour Hercule et pour moi, c'est un homme ordinaire.<sup>40</sup>

The deduction, it may be objected, does not take into account the manifestations of royalism which occur in the plays cited. True, the dramatists did not alter historical attestation in order to glorify kings, and even ignored history in disparaging this or that

<sup>38</sup> I. e., giving up "l'empire d'Asie à la Grèce promis."

<sup>39</sup> He is seen by critics as upholding a majestic dignity (Petit de Julleville, *Le Théâtre en France*, Paris, Colin, 1927, 164; L. B. Picard and J. Peyrot, *Répertoire du Théâtre Français*, Paris, Duprat, 1826, 1e Partie, I, xxxvi).

<sup>40</sup> *Œdipe*, II, 4.

king; but they missed no opportunity to affirm that kings partake of the divine wisdom,

Les Rois comme les Dieux tout-puissants icy bas  
Ont tousiours des clartez que les autres n'ont pas,<sup>41</sup>

that they are above the reach of men,

. . . le trône soutient la majesté des rois  
Au-dessus du mépris, comme au-dessus des lois.<sup>42</sup>

Unfortunately, the utterances are not backed by moral authority, nor ratified by examples; but on the contrary, they come from impeachable sources,<sup>43</sup> and are belied by the spectacles which provoke them.<sup>44</sup>

The plays which I have cited indicate on the part of the XVIIIth century French tragedy an inclination to stigmatize the "art de régner." The hesitancy accorded to kings confronted by "raisons d'État," the attempt to shift responsibility from them to their advisers, the precaution to divorce them from the execution of criminal schemes, the pronouncements regarding the sacredness of their authority do not mask the scars made upon men by the "métier de roi."

MAURICE BAUDIN

*New York University*

<sup>41</sup> Du Ryer, *Alcionée*, I, 1.

<sup>42</sup> Corneille, *Médée*, II, 3.

<sup>43</sup> The first of the two utterances quoted is that of a sycophant (cf. v, 1). The second is made by a king who has betrayed a pledge, and its object is to protect from ridicule an old king in search of young pleasures. Such maxims are usually spoken in self-defense, cf. Garnier, *Antigone*, IV; Hardy, *Didon*, III, 1; Mairret, *Chryséide et Arimand*, v, 3; Rotrou, *Antigone*, II, 4; Mme Deshoulières, *Genséric*, II, 5.

<sup>44</sup> In trying to visualize kingly behavior one naturally recalls that of the monarch (*Hamlet*, IV, 5) who under terrifying circumstances spoke of the "divinity that doth hedge a king." I have found no such concordance of words and conduct in the French plays which I have examined. In some instances the discrepancy is immense. One would hardly guess, for example, that the speech:

. . . je ne rends point compte de mes desseins,  
Ma fille ignore encor mes ordres souverains,  
Et, quand il sera temps qu'elle en soit informée,  
Vous apprendrez son sort, j'en instruirai l'armée

(Racine, *Iphigénie*, IV, 6)

belongs to the most perplexed king in the repertory.

ANTI-SLAVERY OPINION IN THE POEMS OF SOME  
EARLY FRENCH FOLLOWERS OF JAMES THOMSON

In an eloquent anti-slavery pamphlet published in 1826, the abbé Henri Grégoire, carried away by his zeal for abolition, and evidently forgetful of some of his early associates in the movement, wrote:

Dans tous les pays et dans tous les siècles, la classe la plus rampante fut toujours celle des poètes. . . . De nos jours . . . les poètes . . . affluent autour des maîtres de la terre et des heureux du siècle. Si, à défendre la cause des esclaves et de tant d'autres infortunés, il y avait à gagner des pensions, des parchemins, des cordons, des titres, le ban et l'arrière-ban de la littérature voleraient à la curée; mais les malheureux ne peuvent offrir que des bénédictions et des larmes d'attendrissement.<sup>1</sup>

Whether or not the accusation was well founded at this date, the fact may easily be established that several poets who in their day enjoyed real success had protested in no uncertain terms against the evils of slavery and certainly contributed to the growth of abolition sentiment during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It happens, also, that these poets have another common bond in that they are all influenced to some degree, insofar as their descriptive poetry is concerned, by James Thomson's *Seasons*.<sup>2</sup> Their remarks on slavery therefore are of additional interest when compared with Thomson's treatment of this subject.

While Thomson delights in the thought of the felicity of

. . . many a happy isle,  
The seat of blameless Pan, yet undisturbed  
By Christian crimes and Europe's cruel songs,<sup>3</sup>

he nevertheless makes only a brief allusion to the slave trade. In *Summer*, written in 1727, he describes the "direful shark" of the torrid zone:

Lured by the scent  
Of steaming crowds, of rank disease, and death,  
Behold! he rushing cuts the briny flood,

<sup>1</sup> *De la Noblesse de la peau* . . . Paris, 1826, pp. 70-71.

<sup>2</sup> See Margaret M. Cameron, *L'Influence des Saisons de Thomson sur la poésie descriptive en France (1759-1810)*, Paris, 1927, *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> *The Complete Poetical Works of James Thomson*, Oxford ed., London, 1908, *Summer*, ll. 853-855.

Swift as the gale can bear the ship along;  
 And from the partners of that cruel trade  
 Which spoils unhappy Guinea of her sons  
 Demands his share of prey—demands themselves.  
 The stormy fates descend: one death involves  
 Tyrants and slaves. . . .<sup>4</sup>

The expansion of this theme in several poems inspired by *The Seasons* supports Miss Cameron's belief that the imitators of Thomson valued the philosophical and moral content of his poem more highly than the descriptive, thereby turning their English model into an "instrument of propaganda."<sup>5</sup>

In Saint-Lambert's poem *Les Saisons*, first published in 1769, there is no direct mention of slavery until the editions of 1775 and after, when these lines occur:

Qu'on ne me vante plus ce bonheur des climats  
 Où jamais Orion n'envoya les frimas;  
 Qu'un sol riche, un ciel pur, et l'or, soient leur  
 partage:  
 Le nôtre est la raison, l'horreur de l'esclavage. . . .<sup>6</sup>

In his notes to the poem, however, the poet makes an important issue of slavery. He proposes essentially the same question that was to become, eighteen years later, the subject of the abbé Raynal's essay contest: "La découverte de l'Amérique et celle du passage aux Indes par le cap de Bonne-Espérance ont-elles servi au bonheur de l'espèce humaine?" Putting this question in turn to natives of Peru, Mexico, and Panama, he meets unanimous longing for the happy days before the Europeans' invasion. He seeks in the Antilles some descendant of the peaceful tribes that once thrived there, but finds not one: ". . . les restes de cette race ont été mis en pièces sur les étaux des bouchers pour servir de nourriture aux chiens de leurs conquérants."<sup>7</sup> Turning now to the African coast, the poet discovers that the Negroes are in a constant state of warfare, for

les Anglois, les François, les Portugais, avec un art infernal, sement et entretiennent la division parmi ces peuples qui leur vendent leurs prison-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 1015-1023.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 135, 151.

<sup>6</sup> *Œuvres de Saint-Lambert*, Paris, 1795, I, 184.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 214.

niers de guerre. Or je sais comment ces prisonniers sont traités dans nos isles à sucre. . . .<sup>8</sup>

He concludes:

Plusieurs de ces peuples étoient méchants, j'en conviens; mais je dis, avec le marquis de Vauvenargues, "On n'a pas le droit de rendre malheureux ceux qu'on ne peut pas rendre bons."<sup>9</sup>

Le Mierre published in 1779 *Les Fastes, ou les usages de l'année*. In some twenty lines he laments the day when intrepid navigators first touched the shores of

Un peuple hospitalier, plus simple que sauvage,  
Dont les mœurs retraçaient celles du premier âge,  
Et qui sans défiance en sa noble candeur,  
Ouvrait également son pays et son cœur.<sup>10</sup>

In the succeeding epoch of gold-seeking, matters went from bad to worse;

Pour repeupler les lieux ravagés par nos coups,  
Il faut d'autres forfaits trop facile pour vous:  
Vous courez, inhumains, aux rivages d'Afrique,  
Vous traînez dans les fers un peuple pacifique;  
Et le commerce a pu, grand Dieu! le croiroit-on!  
A ces crimes publics prostituer son nom!<sup>11</sup>

In impassioned lines that may have been inspired by a passage in the abbé Raynal's *Histoire des deux Indes*,<sup>12</sup> Le Mierre warns of the dangers of a revolt such as actually took place a score of years later:

Poursuivez, mais craignez que peut-être bientôt  
L'homme dans l'Afrique ne s'éveille en sursaut;  
Du nombre à tout moment l'avantage lui reste,  
A tout moment sur vous pend ce glaive funeste;  
Tremblez qu'il ne s'élève un nouveau Spartacus,  
La nature et l'instinct ne sont jamais vaincus.<sup>13</sup>

Like Saint-Lambert, Le Mierre appends copious notes to his verse. They are particularly concerned with the mistreatment of Negro

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Œuvres de A.-M. Le Mierre*, Paris, 1810, III, 141-142.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 142.

<sup>12</sup> Genève, 1775 (4to ed.), III, 414.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 142-143.

slaves, and add an authoritative note to the poet's argument by generous quotations from a letter allegedly written from Santo Domingo.

Roucher's poem, *Les Mois*, published in two formats in 1779, devotes forty lines to the question:

. . . de quel droit plonger dans l'esclavage  
L'homme innocent et doux, que vous nommez sauvage? <sup>14</sup>

The closing lines attest Roucher's strength of feeling on the subject:

Eh bien! qu'un Dieu vengeur des enfans de l'Afrique,  
Et du sang dont le glaive inonda l'Amérique;  
Qu'un Dieu dans ces climats vous poursuive; et sur vous,  
Des vents, des feux, des eaux déchaîne le courroux;  
Que sous vos pas, la terre ébranlée, entr'ouverte  
S'abyme dans la mer de vos débris couverte;  
Et que votre supplice épouvante à jamais  
L'avare imitateur de vos lâches forfaits! <sup>15</sup>

In his preface, Roucher says that the fifteen pages of notes (twelve in the quarto edition) that form the commentary to the above lines were written by "M. Garat, jeune avocat." With the thoroughness of his profession, Garat defends the Negroes' cause in a long plea addressed to an imaginary European sovereign. He attacks the historical justification of slavery upheld by Grotius and Puffendorf, showing that neither slaves taken in war, nor sold by themselves or by others, nor slaves by birth can legitimately exist in a well-ordered and civilized society. He shows that slavery is incompatible with the Christian religion; that laws like the *Code noir*, designed to protect the slaves, are worthless; that slavery is detrimental to the moral tone of a colony; and, finally, that a revolt of the slaves is a danger hardly worth courting.<sup>16</sup>

Nicolas-Germain Léonard, who was born in Guadeloupe, came into personal contact with Negro slavery during a trip to the Antilles. His disgust is eloquently expressed in prose<sup>17</sup> and verse; in *Les Saisons . . . imité de Thompson [sic]*, published in 1787,

<sup>14</sup> Paris, 1779 (12mo ed.), I, 109. (*Avril, chant II*°).

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 158-172.

<sup>17</sup> See his *Lettre sur un voyage aux Antilles*, in *Œuvres de Léonard*, Paris, 1797, I, 199-203.

Léonard devotes nineteen lines to slavery, some of which are apparently modelled after *The Seasons* [*vide supra*]:

N'avons-nous pas osé, dans ces îles heureuses  
Où Pan faisait danser les Nymphes amoureuses,  
Bannir l'Américain de ses champs paternels?  
*Eh! de quel droit encor l'innocente Guinée,*  
*A nous livrer ses fils est-elle condamnée? . . .*  
L'Amour voluptueux qui jouait sur des fleurs,  
S'envole au bruit des fouets et des cris de douleurs:  
A force de travaux, de peines, de supplices,  
On leur fait un enfer de ces lieux de délices. . .<sup>18</sup>  
La terre s'en indigne; et l'affreux ouragan  
Engloutit à la fois l'esclave et le tyran.<sup>19</sup>

To the poems of André Chénier in which Miss Cameron traces influences of Thomson, I would add his posthumous *La République de lettres*. In this poem we read of the greedy trader whose

. . . hardis vaisseaux, déjà loin de nos ports,  
Vont de l'Inde à vil prix acheter les trésors;  
Ou pour lui l'Amérique, à nos mœurs façonnée  
Ravit les noirs enfants de la triste Guinée.<sup>20</sup>

The last line is clearly Thomson's

Which spoils unhappy Guinea of her sons.

Chénier's feeling on the slavery question is discovered, also, among the prose fragments of the poem *L'Amérique*, in which the description of the tropics was probably influenced by *The Seasons*.<sup>21</sup>

O postérité! . . . Tu lis avec effroi que des hommes blancs vont acheter des hommes noirs et les plongent vivants dans les mines d'Amérique . . . tu lis qu'ils dépendent du plus vain caprice d'un maître imbécile, féroce

<sup>18</sup> This contrast between exotic charm and the horrors of slavery recalls a remark made in 1773 by another creole poet, Evariste Parry, in an epistolary poem addressed to his brother from Rio de Janeiro: "Ce pays-ci est un paradis terrestre; la terre y produit abondamment les fruits de tous les climats; l'air y est sain; les mines d'or et de pierreries y sont très nombreuses: mais à tous ces avantages il en manque un, qui seul peut donner du prix aux autres, c'est la liberté: tout est ici dans l'esclavage . . ." (*Œuvres d'Evariste Parry*, Paris, 1808, I, 216-217).

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 77, 78. Italics mine.

<sup>20</sup> *Œuvres complètes de André Chénier*, ed. Dimoff, Paris, n. d., II, 233.

<sup>21</sup> Cameron, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-85.

et doué d'une âme de vil esclave . . . que pour la plus légère faute ils sont déchirés de coups de fouet . . . que les femmes se distinguent par leur cruauté à commander et à regarder les horribles spectacles. . . .

O barbares Européens, vous faites tant d'institutions inutiles . . . (V. Montesq.) Vos livres parlent tant d'humanité. Cœurs pitoyables, vous ne connaissez pas la pitié de loin. Vous osez vous enrichir du fruit de ces horreurs. Vous n'avez aucune honte. Vous ne tremblez pas à l'idée des malédictions de la postérité qui vous attendent. . . .

L'âme de Colomb peut dire cela.<sup>22</sup>

During the decade following the reestablishment of slavery in 1802, at least four poets—all of them influenced to some degree by Thomson—continued to keep faith with the humanitarian ideals of their predecessors who had contributed to the abolition sentiment that triumphed temporarily in 1794.

Jacques Delille, author of *Les Jardins* and *L'Homme des champs*, recalls in a later poem, *La Pitié* (1802), the recent slave revolts in Santo Domingo:

Tairai-je ces enfants de la rive africaine,  
Qui cultivent pour nous la terre américaine?  
Différents de couleur, ils ont les mêmes droits;  
Vous-mêmes contre vous les armez de vos lois. . . .  
O champs de Saint-Domingue! ô scènes exécrables!  
Ah! fuyez, sauvez-vous, familles déplorables!  
Les tigres sont lancés; du soleil africain  
Tous les feux à-la-fois bouillonnent dans leur sein. . . .  
Quelle cause a produit ces fléaux désastreux?  
Quelques abus des droits que vous aviez sur eux.<sup>23</sup>  
Leur haine s'en souvient; et la noire imposture  
Dans leurs cœurs ulcérés vint aigrir cette injure.<sup>24</sup>

In *Chant II*<sup>e</sup> of his *Géorgiques françaises*,<sup>25</sup> Rougier de La Bergerie refers to the suffering of Peruvian and Mexican slaves who are forced to mine gold for their European masters under intolerable conditions. Although he cites La Condamine's opinion, that "il n'a vu nulle part l'homme dans un état plus abject et plus misérable que dans les mines du Pérou," La Bergerie's criticism of this aspect of slavery is antedated by that of Las Casas in the

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 100-101.

<sup>23</sup> The unfortunate conflict of thought between this line and the third line of the quotation was noted by Dupuy des Islets, in his *Examen critique du poème de La Pitié de J. D.* . . . , Paris, 1803, pp. 122-123.

<sup>24</sup> *La Pitié*, poème, Paris, 1822, pp. 33-35.

<sup>25</sup> Paris, 1804, I, 48-49, and note 7.



sixteenth century, as well as Roucher, Raynal, Marmontel, Voltaire and others in his own time.

Ecouchard Le Brun, who may be considered a follower of Thomson in his fragmentary poem *La Nature*, approaches the subject of slavery in the same vein in an ode, *Contre le Luxe*, published in 1811. Nature, speaking, says:

Je cachais donc en vain l'Or au fond des Abîmes!  
 Vous vous précipitez dans ces Gouffres pervers;  
 Et des Sources de l'Or jaillissent tous les Crimes  
 Dont vous inondez l'Univers.

Turning to Negro slavery, he continues:

Le Niger a vendu ses Fils et son Rivage  
 A vos Brigands d'Europe! et, si nous les croyons,  
 Flambeau sacré du Jour, cet indigne esclavage  
 Est le Crime de tes rayons! <sup>28</sup>

While it was commonly believed at this time that the color of the Negro was caused by the sun's rays, it is nevertheless possible to see a resemblance between Le Brun's reproach to the sun, and these lines of Thomson:

. . . The parent sun himself  
 Seems o'er this world of slaves to tyrannize,  
 And, with oppressive ray the roseate bloom  
 Of beauty blasting, gives the gloomy hue  
 And features gross—or, worse, to ruthless deeds,  
 Mad jealousy, blind rage, and fell revenge  
 Their fervid spirit fires. . . .

*Summer*, ll. 884-890.

Sometime during the first decade and a half of the nineteenth century, Millevoye wrote a touching poem called *Le pauvre Nègre*.

Ravi naguère aux côtes de Guinée,  
 Le pauvre Nègre, accablé de ses maux,  
 Pleurait un jour sa triste destinée. . . .

The Negro had been snatched by his captors from a happy land, a loving wife, and an unborn child. One day he meets a slave newly arrived from his former home.

'De ma Nelzi, frère, quelle nouvelle?'  
 L'autre se tait, mais il montre les cieux.  
 'Je t'entends: morte. Et l'enfant?—Mort comme elle.  
 —Bien.' Et la joie éclata dans ses yeux.

<sup>28</sup> *Œuvres de Le Brun*, Paris, 1811, I, 313-314.

Deux jours entiers, jetant sa nourriture,  
 Il haleta sous un ciel embrasé;  
 Et, du matin jusqu'à la nuit obscure,  
 De ses sueurs le sol fut arrosé.  
 Vers le retour de la troisième aurore,  
 La verge en main, le maître reparut:  
 'Lève-toi!—Non; je puis dormir encore;  
 Je deviens libre.' Et sur l'heure il mourut.<sup>27</sup>

The contribution of the earlier poets discussed above to humanitarian thought confirms my conclusion reached in a study of Evariste Parny,<sup>28</sup> that "it seems pertinent . . . to suggest a serious qualification of the idea that in eighteenth century French poetry 'aucune œuvre [excepting Voltaire's] ne compte dans l'histoire de la pensée.'"<sup>29</sup> Of significance also are the poets who, following the slave revolts at the end of that century, refused to accept the rampant disillusion expressed by Chateaubriand in his *Génie du christianisme* (Book IV, ch. vii): ". . . qui oseroit encore plaider la cause des noirs, après les crimes qu'ils ont commis?" They upheld the cause of abolition during the score of years that preceded Victor Hugo's first novel, *Bug-Jargal* (written in 1818), wherein the noble and heroic Negro became an established figure in French literature.

EDWARD D. SEEBER

College of Charleston.

### LE PÈRE BOUHOURS ET LE TASSE

De tous les auteurs étrangers que le Père Bouhours mentionne au cours de ses ouvrages, c'est le Tasse auquel il revient le plus souvent, soit pour signaler ses défauts, soit pour citer de ses vers. A l'égard du poète italien il a une double attitude assez curieuse, mais qui n'est pas rare pendant l'époque classique. D'un côté, il fait les réserves habituelles sur les pointes, l'affectation et les jolieses qui déparent le poème national et chrétien du Tasse; de l'autre, il considère la *Jérusalem* comme un magasin de pensées élevées et de beaux vers, où l'homme de lettres cultivé peut puiser à pleines mains pour orner ses discours.

<sup>27</sup> *Œuvres de Millevoye*, Paris, Garnier, n. d., pp. 127-129.

<sup>28</sup> "Parny as an Opponent of Slavery," *MLN.*, XLIX (1934), 360-366.

<sup>29</sup> G. Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 22d ed., revised, Paris, n. d., p. 644.

La critique de Bouhours, dit son biographe G. Doncieux, est "purement dogmatique et non descriptive, sauf pour un joli morceau à propos du Tasse."<sup>1</sup> Ce morceau se trouve dans les *Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* (1671), qui eurent dix éditions ou réimpressions en vingt ans :

Je vous assure, dit Eugène, que le Tasse n'est pas toujours le plus raisonnable du monde. A la vérité on ne peut pas avoir plus de génie qu'il en a. Ses imaginations sont nobles & agréables; ses sentimens sont forts ou délicats, selon que le sujet le demande; ses passions sont bien touchées & bien conduites; toutes ses descriptions sont merveilleuses: mais son génie l'emporte quelquefois trop loin; il est trop fleuri en quelques endroits, il badine dans les rencontres assez sérieuses; il ne garde pas aussi exactement que Virgile, toutes les bienséances des mœurs. Il a de si grandes beautés, repartit Ariste, qu'on peut bien luy pardonner ces petites taches. S'il manque un peu de ce bon sens, qui distingue Virgile des autres Poètes; il a beaucoup de ce beau feu qui fait les Poètes. Après tout, quelque liberté qu'il se donne, il ne s'égare pas comme le Marin, ni comme l'Arioste.<sup>2</sup>

Bouhours reprend la question dans la *Manière de bien penser dans les ouvrages d'esprit* (1687). Ce sont Eudoxe et Philante qui parlent. Eudoxe aime ce qui est naturel et raisonnable, il préfère les Anciens. Philante est charmé de tout ce qui est fleuri, de tout ce qui brille. "Il est si entêté de la *Gierusalemme liberata*, qu'il la préfère sans façon à l'Iliade et à l'Enéide. A cela près il a de l'esprit. . . ." Dans les discussions sur le Tasse dans ce livre c'est généralement Eudoxe qui a le dernier mot. Il trouve que le récit de la mort d'Argant manque de vraisemblance,<sup>3</sup> il avoue que le poème contient des pensées exprimées d'une manière noble et sublime et que ses héros ont des sentimens fort relevés,<sup>4</sup> mais il préfère l'*Enéide* "qui n'a rien dans les pensées que de noble & de régulier."<sup>5</sup> Il blâme l'affectation dans le portrait de Sophronie, dans l'adieu d'Armide à Renaud, et surtout dans l'*Aminta*.<sup>6</sup>

Les Poètes Italiens ne sont guère naturels, ils fardent tout, & le Tasse par ce seul endroit est bien au dessous de Virgile. . . . Le Tasse qui est un si beau génie, tient un peu du caractère des femmes coquettes, qui

<sup>1</sup> Georges Doncieux, *Un Jésuite homme de lettres au dix-septième siècle, Le Père Bouhours*, Paris, Hachette, 1866, p. 245.

<sup>2</sup> *Entretiens*, édition d'Amsterdam, 1691, pp. 207-208.

<sup>3</sup> *Manière*, troisième édition, Amsterdam, 1705, p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 114.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 266, 269, 333.

mettent du fard, quelque belles qu'elles soyent. . . . Je ne parle pas du Marin. . . . Je parle du Prince de la Poésie Italienne, & je soutiens que le Tasse est en mille endroits plus agréable qu'il ne faut. . . . Il badine quelquefois, même dans les sujets tristes, & raffine dans les occasions où le raffinement est fort mauvais.<sup>7</sup>

Bouhours revient à la charge dans ses *Pensées ingénieuses des Anciens et des Modernes* (1689), où il critique le portrait d'Armide dans le camp chrétien et certains vers du combat entre Tancrède et Argant.<sup>8</sup>

Ces critiques du père jésuite contre le Tasse sont, en somme, bien fondées et ne diffèrent guère de celles faites par Chapelain ou même par Boileau.<sup>9</sup> Bouhours était d'accord avec la plupart des critiques ses contemporains pour condamner les "extravagances italiennes" et le "cliquant du Tasse" en faveur du "bon sens" de Virgile et de l'âge de Louis XIV. Il y avait danger que les faiseurs de poèmes épiques français fussent tentés d'imiter les côtés jolis de l'épopée italienne, et le style français ne le permettait pas, selon Bouhours.

La langue Italienne est une coquette toujours parée & toujours fardée, qui ne cherche qu'à plaire, & qui se plaît beaucoup à la bagatelle. La langue Française est une prude; mais une prude agréable. . . .<sup>10</sup>

Mais le révérend père, tout en faisant officiellement ces critiques, éprouvait un charme secret et irrésistible à fréquenter cette coquette parée dans les vers du Tasse. Il semble avoir lu et relu le poème, il le connaît à fond et il prend plaisir à le citer à tout bout de champ. Dans l'entretien sur *La Mer* il reproduit à cinq reprises des vers du Tasse, citant plusieurs fois de mémoire, et incorrectement.<sup>11</sup> Dans le dialogue de *La Langue française*, il compare cette langue à une reine "laquelle a dans toute sa personne je ne sçay

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 268, 269, 334, 345. Cf. aussi pp. 348, 371, 380, 381. On sait qu'une traduction italienne de la *Manière de bien penser* donna lieu à une querelle littéraire franco-italienne. Cf. F. Foffano, *Ricerche letterarie*, Livorno, 1897 et A. Boeri, *Una contesa letteraria franco-italiana*, Palermo, 1900. Je n'ai pu voir ce dernier ouvrage.

<sup>8</sup> *Pensées ingénieuses*, édition de la Haye, 1721, pp. 6, 22-23 (où il cite Méré).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. R. Bray, *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France*, Paris, Hachette, 1927, pp. 187-188.

<sup>10</sup> *Entretiens*, p. 75.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 13, 18, 33.

quel air majestueux, qui la fait toujours paroître ce qu'elle est, quelque habit qu'elle porte, & quelque action qu'elle fasse." Il recourt à la "coquette parée et fardée" pour compléter sa description de la reine "prude agréable":

Non copre habito vil la nobil luce,  
E quanto è in lei d'altero e di gentile:  
E fuor la maestà regia traluce  
Per gli atti ancor de l'essercito humile.<sup>12</sup>

La langue française "ne se pare qu'autant que la nécessité & la bienséance le demandent.

D'alta beltà, ma sua beltà non cura;  
O tanto sol quant'honestà s'infregi."<sup>13</sup>

Le *Bel esprit*, tel que le décrit Bouhours, pour avoir beaucoup de force, n'en a pas moins de délicatesse: "Il ressemble à l'Achille d'Homère, & au Renaud du Tasse, qui avoient des nerfs, & des muscles extrêmement forts sous une peau blanche & delicate. . . ." Ou encore, "un bel esprit doit à mon avis, garder le temperament de la Sophronie du Tasse, qui étoit également belle et modeste,

Non copri sue bellezze, e non l'espose."<sup>14</sup>

Dans le même entretien Bouhours paie un tribut d'éloges à son ami le comte de Saint-Pol: "Il y a long tems que je l'ay comparé au Renaud du Tasse, & que je luy ay appliqué ces quatre vers comme par un esprit de prophétie.

L'età precorse, e la speranza; e presti  
Pareano i fior, quando n'uscìro frutti:  
Se 'l miri fulminar frà l'arme avvolto  
Marte lo stimi; Amor, se scopre il volto."<sup>15</sup>

En parlant du *Je ne sçay quoy*, Bouhours cite six exemples du *non so che* italien, dont cinq sont pris dans le Tasse.<sup>16</sup> Encore

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48. Cf. *Ger. lib.*, VII, 18; c'est Herminie habillée en bergère et occupée aux exercices de la vie champêtre.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61. Cf. *Ger. lib.*, II, 14.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215. Ce vers est cité encore dans les *Pensées ingénieuses*, p. 141.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 240. La phrase de Bouhours se rapporte vraisemblablement à la première édition des *Entretiens* où, en réalité, il n'avait cité que les deux derniers vers du passage du Tasse.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 253-254.

deux citations viennent sous sa plume dans le même dialogue.<sup>17</sup> Dans celui des *Devises*, il mentionne une invention à lui : un Soleil dans sa course, avec ce vers du Tasse :

Rapido sì, ma rapido con legge,

et propose une devise hypothétique avec les mots :

Dentro hai le fiamme e fuori il pianto.<sup>18</sup>

La *Manière de bien penser*, tout en critiquant sévèrement le Tasse, déclare que "sa *Gierusalemme* est pleine de pensées sublimes, & il ne faut que l'ouvrir pour en trouver tant qu'on veut," et en cite une dizaine d'exemples.<sup>19</sup> Les *Pensées ingénieuses* en donnent d'autres, que l'auteur avait recueillies pour les faire entrer dans la *Manière* sans y avoir trouvé leur place. "Ce sont des Diamans, qui ont leur prix, mais qu'on n'a point enchassés."<sup>20</sup> Même dans les *Doutes sur la langue françoise* (1674), Bouhours a trouvé moyen de renvoyer une fois au Tasse.<sup>21</sup>

Il n'y a aucun auteur ancien ou moderne que Bouhours cite aussi fréquemment ou avec autant de plaisir évident que le Tasse. Tout en le condamnant, il l'adore. Et cela est vrai aussi, à différents degrés, pour ses contemporains. Même si l'on n'approuvait pas la *Gerusalemme* comme un modèle parfait de poème national, il était de bon ton, après Boileau comme avant, de le connaître et d'avoir ses plus beaux vers au bout de la langue. Le chevalier de Méré a parfaitement exprimé cette opinion, en écrivant à une dame :

Vous parlez simplement, vous ne dites ny de beaux mots ny de belles choses. . . . Vous n'avez que peu de commerce avec les beaux esprits, et vous ne citez ny le Tasse ny l'Arioste. Pensez-vous qu'avec cette indifférence on puisse faire admirer son esprit? <sup>22</sup>

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 260.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 388, 296; cf. *Ger. lib.*, III, 2 et XII, 96.

<sup>19</sup> *Manière*, pp. 99-109.

<sup>20</sup> *Pensées ingénieuses, Avertissement* et pp. 40, 79-80, 89, 141, 158, 176, 209, 306, 323.

<sup>21</sup> Edition de 1675, p. 241.

<sup>22</sup> Méré, *Discours de l'Esprit, Œuvres complètes*, éd. Boudhors, Paris, Editions Fernand Roches, 1930, t. II, p. 58. Voir pour un exemple de la même attitude dans la première partie du siècle, mon article sur "Guez de Balzac and Tasso," *MLN.*, mai 1934.

SOME JUDGMENTS OF VOLTAIRE BY  
CONTEMPORARIES

After Voltaire's death in 1778, it became popular to write plays dealing with his arrival and judgment in the afterworld. In the year 1779 there appeared four plays based on this subject. 1) *Les Muses rivales* by M. de la Harpe depicted the Muses fighting for the right to present Voltaire to Apollo, each claiming the privilege because Voltaire was her favorite. 2) *La Vengeance de Pluton, ou Suite des Muses rivales* by Palmézeaux portrayed Pluto, angry with Apollo for having taken Voltaire, getting revenge by killing Apollo's favorites on earth. 3) *Les Muses véridiques*, according to Brunet by Mullot, is exactly the opposite of the *Muses rivales*. It showed the Muses visibly perturbed by the impending arrival of Voltaire, offering Voltaire to each other as they explain how he betrayed them on earth, until Melpomene finally agrees to sponsor him. Voltaire is given his place in the Temple of Memory, below Racine, below Corneille, beside Crébillon, while Fréron, seated among the good critics, looks on. 4) *L'Ombre de Voltaire aux Champs-Élysées* attributed to Moline is an exorbitant eulogy of Voltaire, ending with the presentation by Sophocles, Sappho, Anacreon and Homer of their choicest gifts and Voltaire's coronation by Apollo.

It can readily be seen that these plays, biased as they are, cannot be accepted as accurate appraisals of Voltaire. They err by being either too favorable or too critical. But simultaneously with them there circulated another shorter literary form, the dialogue. In a small 14-page pamphlet, entitled *Dialogue entre Voltaire et Rousseau, après leur passage du Styx*, published in Geneva in 1778, is to be found a very interesting portrait of Voltaire, remarkable for the accuracy of its judgment. The unknown contemporary author wrote the dialogue in order to show that Rousseau and Voltaire, on meeting after death, were at once reconciled. After a discussion of their work, in which Voltaire points out that he and Rousseau in reality did not differ except "par la bizarrerie de vos paradoxes, la singularité de vos pensées, et le caractère original de vos expressions," Voltaire admits that he was too vain, Rousseau too proud, and concludes "Soyons amis, Rousseau, c'est moi qui t'en convie."

Having finished the dialogue, the unknown author offers on the last page the following *Portrait d'Arouet de Voltaire*:

Avare au sein des richesses, indigné contre les Critiques, comblé des louanges de l'Europe, poursuivi par les Loix, adoré par les Juges, honoré par les Souverains, même en éprouvant leur disgrâce; Poète et Prosateur hardi et heureux, il eut plus de connoissances que de justesse, plus de brillant que de mérite solide, moins de science que de goût, plus d'adresse que de prudence, plus de gloire que d'estime; enfin, personne ne fut son égal, quoique parmi les Anciens et les Modernes il ait eu son supérieur dans tous les genres de la Littérature: son imagination fut la rivale du Génie.

In contrast to the excessive judgments, both favorable and unfavorable, of the plays written about Voltaire shortly after his death, we are grateful for this succinct but exceedingly accurate estimate, which shows that Voltaire's real reputation was intelligently appraised by an unbiased contemporary.

CLIFFORD M. CRIST

Princeton University

## CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO BENGESCO'S BIBLIOGRAPHIE

### 1. *Dialogues entre un Bracmane et un Jésuite.*

Contrary to Moland, Bengesco and others, this work did not appear for the first time in 1756. It appeared in the ephemeral publication, *l'Abeille du Parnasse*, of Berlin, in the issue for "5 février 1752."

### 2. *Poèmes sur la religion naturelle et sur la destruction de Lisbonne. Par M. de V \* \* \*. 1756. (47 pp.)*

### 3. *Lettres chinoises, indiennes et tartares à M. Paw par un Bénédictin. Avec plusieurs autres pièces intéressantes. Paris, 1776. (182 pp. of text plus title page and table of contents.)*

### 4. *La Henriade, Londres, 1727.*

This edition is mentioned in the preface to the *Oeuvres diverses de M. de Voltaire*, Londres, Nourse, 1746. A marginal note in the Bibliothèque nationale copy of Moland says the edition has a beginning quite different from the Moland variant.

### 6. *La Henriade, avec les variantes et un essai sur la poésie épique. Amsterdam, Fr. l'Honoré, 1756, 2 vols. in -12.*



6. *La Henriade, avec les variantes et un essai sur la poésie épique. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée.* Amsterdam, Richoff, 1769, in-12.
7. *La Henriade, en dix chants avec la dissertation sur la mort d'Henri IV.* Evreux, Ancelle, 1784, in-12.
8. *La Pucelle d'Orléans. Poème divisé en quinze livres. Par Monsieur de V \* \* \*. Nouvelle édition plus correcte que la précédente. Augmenté d'un épître du père Guibourdon à Monsieur de Voltaire,* Louvain, 1756.
9. *Prix de la justice et de l'humanité,* Londres, 1777.
10. *Catéchisme de l'honnête homme ou dialogue entre un caloyer et un homme de bien. Traduit du grec vulgaire par D. J. J. R. C. D. C. D. G.* Paris, 1758, in-8.
11. *Epître à l'auteur du nouveau livre des trois imposteurs par M. de Voltaire.* Berlin, 1769, in-8.
12. *Le Micromégas de M. de Voltaire, à Londres,* 1752.
13. *Histoire de Charles XII, roy de Suède. Huitième édition de Christophe Revis, plus ample et plus correcte que les précédentes, augmentée des critiques de La Motraye et des réponses à ces critiques.* Basle, Revis, 1736.
14. *Lettre sur Mlle de l'Enclos.*

Bengesco says (II, 58): Ce morceau est imprimé dans le tome III des *Nouveaux Mélanges* (1765, pp. 1-14) . . . Nous croyons qu'il a été composé en 1751. . . . This surmise proves correct as the work is found in *le Petit Réservoir*, volume IV, for 1751.

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

*University of California at Los Angeles*

#### LA NOCHEBUENA DE 1836 Y SU MODELO HORACIANO

No se han señalado hasta ahora, que yo sepa, las relaciones existentes entre éste, uno de los más representativos artículos de Larra, y aquella sátira de Horacio—la 7ª del Libro II—en la cual Davo, esclavo del propio Horacio, se encara con su amo, y valiéndose de la libertad de expresión otorgada a los esclavos durante las saturnales, hace con toda impunidad una crítica despiadada del carácter y costumbres del poeta.

Empecemos por anotar los puntos más visiblemente en común entre las dos composiciones:

1. El marco y escenario del mes de diciembre, con el recuerdo concreto del tema latino: "Me acordé de que en sus famosas saturnales los romanos trocaban los papeles y los esclavos podían decir la verdad a sus amos."<sup>1</sup> (Cl. Cast. pág. 331, 20.)

2. Recriminaciones del sirviente a su amo, las cuales por formar el asunto principal del diálogo, aparecen constantemente tanto en el poema como en el artículo.

3. Soledad moral y descontento de sí mismo: "Resuelto a no moverme porque tuviera que hacerlo todo la suerte este mes, incliné la frente, cargada como el cielo, de nubes frías, etc." (Id. pág. 330, 4-28.) Y más adelante en la reconvención del criado: "¿Por qué te vuelves y te revuelves en tu mullido lecho como un criminal acostado con su remordimiento, etc."<sup>2</sup> (Id. pág. 337, 21.)

4. Seducción o adulterio: "Verdad es que la justicia no prende sino a los pequeños criminales . . . pero a los que arrebatan el sosiego de una familia seduciendo a la mujer casada o a la hija honesta etc."<sup>3</sup> (pág. 338, 4-26.)

5. Inconsecuencia en costumbres y principios: "Los hombres

<sup>1</sup> En la sátira de Horacio, Davo solicita permiso de su amo para decir unas palabras; Horacio, siguiendo la antigua tradición romana, se lo concede inmediatamente. Versos 1-5. (Considero poco conveniente y hasta superfluo el citar del texto latino, ya que las relaciones que estudiamos son de contenido y no de estilo. De aquí en adelante me referiré en llamada a los versos del original latino, citando a continuación de la traducción castellana de Don Javier de Burgos: *Las Poesías de Horacio*, Madrid, 1820-23. Creo justificable este procedimiento por dos razones: la edición de Don Javier de Burgos era considerada la mayor autoridad en la materia, y Larra, que no era precisamente un latinista, debió de consultarla con preferencia a cualquier otra.)

<sup>2</sup> Versos 111-115. En la traducción de Burgos: "Añadiré que los ocios Aprovechar no sabiendo, Ni una hora á solas con vos Podeis nunca manteneros, Y sin cesar, de vos mismo Como un desertor huyendo, Solo tratais de ahogar La zozobra en vino ó sueño: En vano, pues siempre os sigue Tan terrible compañero." (Ed. cit. t. 3, págs. 465 y 467.)

<sup>3</sup> Versos 46-74. En la traducción de Burgos: "Mas vos, cuando abandonando Anillo de caballero, Y toga de ciudadano, Y de juez trage y respeto, Envolveis vuestra cabeza En un capuchon de siervo. ¿No venis, cual pareceis, A ser un siervo en efecto? Al cuarto entraís de la dama, Pero temblándoos los huesos, Pues dentro de vos combaten Juntos temor y deseo . . . Sobre vos tiene el marido Igual y aun mayor derecho Que en su muger, pues que sois Vos su corruptor perverso." (t. 3, págs. 457 y 459.)

de mundo os llamáis hombres de honor y de carácter, y a cada suceso nuevo cambiáis de opinión, apostatáis de vuestros principios.”<sup>4</sup> (pág. 340, 4-11.)

6. Adulación al poderoso: “Adulas a tus lectores para ser de ellos adulado. . . .”<sup>5</sup>

7. Lujo desenfrenado en el servicio de la mesa: “. . . acaso tendrás que someterte mañana a un usurero para un cápricho innecesario, porque vosotros tragáis oro, o para un banquete de vanidad en que cada bocado es un tósigo.”<sup>6</sup> (pág. 340, 18-22.)

8. Contraste entre el erotismo del sirviente y el del amo: “Cuando yo necesito de mujeres, echo mano de mi salario, y las encuentro, fieles por más de un cuarto de hora; tú echas mano de tu corazón, y vas y lo arrojas a los pies de la primera que pasa, etc.”<sup>7</sup> (pág. 340, 27-pág. 341, 8.)

9. Rebelión moral del sirviente ante su señor: “Tú me mandas pero no te mandas a tí mismo . . . Yo estoy ebrio de vino, es verdad; pero tú lo estás de deseos y de impotencia.”<sup>8</sup> (pág. 341, 19.)

<sup>4</sup> Versos 6-42. En la traducción de Burgos: “Siempre encarecer os veo Vida y costumbres de antaño; Mas no aceptarais el trueco, Si quisiera trasladaros Algun dios á aquellos tiempos . . . Deseais en Roma el campo; E inconsecuente y ligero, Cuando en el campo os hallais, Poneis á Roma en el cielo. etc.” (t. 3, págs. 453 y 455.)

<sup>5</sup> Versos 30-42. En la sátira de Horacio, la adulación se refiere implícitamente a Mecenas.

<sup>6</sup> Versos 102-111. En la traducción de Burgos: “De los continuos excesos Castigo es la indigestion, Y los pies endebles luego Rehusan llevar la carga Del mal humorado cuerpo. Delinque quien da por frutas Algun chismecillo viejo Que substraño; y el que vende Sus haciendas á ruin precio, Por satisfacer su gula, ¿Delinquirá mucho menos?” (t. 3, pág. 465.)

<sup>7</sup> Versos 46-74 y 88-94. En la traducción de Burgos: “. . . Cuando siento Los impulsos del amor, A una casa de esas entro; Alli conversacion trabo Con la primera que veo; Cuando despacho, desfilo, Sin temer que mi concepto Tal aventura mancille, Ni me atormente el recelo, De que luego á la tal moza Haga otro iguales obsequios.” (t. 3, pág. 457.) “Os pide cierta querida Dos mil y quinientos pesos, Y despues rabiardos hace, Os cierra la puerta al veros, Echa agua por las ventanas, Y luego os llama de nuevo . . . ‘Libre soy, decid, soy libre.’ Mas no será, porque fiero Vuestra alma un tirano oprime, etc.” (*id.*, pág. 463.)

<sup>8</sup> Versos 75-82. En la traducción de Burgos: “Y; qué! ¿vos sereis mi dueño, Cuando asi de hombres y cosas Os sometéis al imperio; . . .

Todos estos elementos en común se nos presentan considerablemente elaborados—aunque desde distintos puntos de vista—en ambas composiciones. Adviértanse, ahora, dos rasgos más, de escasa importancia en el poema latino, y a los cuales da Larra un desarrollo dramático independiente.

10. Glotonería y embriaguez del sirviente.<sup>9</sup>

11. Hipocresía. Disfraz de bellas palabras: “. . . inventas palabras y haces de ellas sentimientos, ciencias, artes, objetos de existencia . . . Y cuando descubres que son palabras, blasfemas y maldices.”<sup>10</sup> (pág. 341, 10-14.)

Añádase, todavía—y presento este punto sólo a manera de conjetura—un posible paralelismo entre el pasaje referente a la función teatral a la que asiste el autor en su capacidad de crítico profesional, y aquel pasaje de la sátira en que Horacio contempla—igualmente en actitud crítica—las pinturas de Pausias.<sup>11</sup>

Y, por último, otra semejanza más, ésta de orden estilístico. El diálogo entre amo y sirviente, a poco de empezar queda en suspenso en ambas composiciones; y aunque sólo escuchamos una voz, la del sirviente, se hace sentir dramáticamente la presencia del personaje que no habla.

Los puntos en común entre las dos obras son, pues, tan numerosos y tan concretos, que habremos de concluir, no sólo que se trata de una imitación directa, sino que Larra se guiaba por una lectura reciente de la sátira horaciana y no por vagos recuerdos de lejanas lecturas.

Ahora bien, ¿habrá imposibilidad alguna de admitir una imitación directa dada la estética de Larra? Sin duda, no. Recuérdese

Y¿ qué soy yo con respecto A vos? Vos en mi mandais, Pero en vos mandan doscientos, Que os mueven cual sus figuras Mueven los titiriteros.” (t. 3, pág. 461.)

<sup>9</sup> Versos 38-39 y 102-104. En la traducción de Burgos: “En buen hora otros me digan Que soy tambien glotonzuelo; Que al olor de un plato rico . . . Que las tabernas frecuento.” Y luego: “Si de un pastel calentito Con el olor me consuelo, Yo soy un gloton. . .” (t. 3, págs. 455-457, 465.)

<sup>10</sup> Versos 41-42. En la traducción de Burgos: “Mas con brillantes palabras Vuestras faltas encubriendo. . .” (t. 3, pág. 457.)

<sup>11</sup> Versos 95-102. En la traducción de Burgos: “Cuando arrobado ó suspenso Mirais un cuadro de Pausias . . . De cosa de antigüedades Entiende que es un portento.” (t. 3, págs. 463 y 465.)

especialmente su teoría del *artículo robado*, detalladamente expuesta en la nota preliminar a *El pobrecito hablador*: "Siendo nuestro objeto divertir por cualquier medio, cuando no se le ocurra a nuestra pobre imaginación nada que nos parezca suficiente o satisfactorio, declaramos francamente que robaremos donde podamos nuestros materiales, publicándolos íntegros o mutilados, traducidos, arreglados o refundidos, citando la fuente, o apropiándonoslos descaradamente, porque como pobres habladores hablamos lo nuestro y lo ajeno, seguros de que al público lo que le importa en lo que se le da impreso no es el nombre del escritor, sino la calidad del escrito, y de que vale más divertir con cosas ajenas que fastidiar con las propias."<sup>12</sup>

Dos tipos principales de imitación se encuentran en Larra, y los resultados no pueden ser más opuestos. Cuando Larra se enfrenta con un modelo literario, expresión de una modalidad estética demasiado particularista, su trabajo resulta artísticamente estéril. Sirva como ejemplo *El Doncel de Don Enrique*, el cual se mueve dentro de la órbita estética trazada por la novelística de Walter Scott. Por el contrario, cuando su modelo excluye la posibilidad de una imitación puramente artística y formal, o bien por lo imperfecto y nada exclusivo de su estilo (Jouy), o bien por hallarse a gran distancia de las preocupaciones y modas literarias del momento, como ocurre con los temas clásicos, entonces Larra, al revitalizar el tema en términos de su propia experiencia, crea una obra de poderosa originalidad. La imitación le ha servido únicamente de punto de partida.

Este segundo caso es el de *La Nochebuena de 1836*. La paradoja estoica "sólo el sabio es libre," idea central de la sátira horaciana, queda aquí desplazada por un tema de sentido vital y subjetivo: pesimismo romántico. Y lo que en Horacio constituye una sobria y elegante lección de filosofía moral, en Larra es ya febril y doloroso autoanálisis, lírico gemido de desesperación.

AUGUSTO CENTENO

*Princeton University*

---

<sup>12</sup> Toda la nota es de gran interés para el estudio de la imitación literaria en Larra.

BAUDELAIRE AND *MONSTRUM HORRENDUM*,  
*INFORME, INGENS*

Baudelaire's *Hymne à la Beauté*, line 22, reads: "O Beauté! monstre énorme, effrayant, ingénu." I do not recall having seen any comment on the sources of this. Virgil, in the *Aeneid*, III, line 658, a famous line, describes Polyphemus as: "*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.*" There are striking resemblances between Baudelaire's verse and the first part of Virgil's. *Monstrum* gives *monstre*; *horrendum* and *informe* suggest *effrayant*; *ingens* suggests *énorme* and also *ingénu*. It may seem a far cry from "la Beauté" to the monster Polyphemus. But given the fame of Virgil's line, the similarity of language and thought in the two passages, and Baudelaire's imp of perversity, which would make him delight in finding a "correspondance" between two such extremes, it is difficult to refrain from believing that the French poet had in mind the Latin poet's words when he wrote his own.

GEORGE N. HENNING

*George Washington University*

PORTO-RICHE ET ROSTAND

A propos de Rostand bien des noms ont été cités, bien des "sources" ont été découvertes. On a évoqué entre autres Shakespeare, Hugo, Musset, Banville, Coppée. Il leur doit sans doute quelque chose à tous, il les a lus, et il n'a pas pu les oublier quand il écrivait. Mais pourquoi ne mentionne-t-on jamais le nom d'un auteur dont Rostand semble se souvenir plus souvent que de tous les autres réunis? A ma connaissance personne n'a jamais cité le nom de Porto-Riche.<sup>1</sup> Quoi! dira-t-on, Porto-Riche! Que peut-il avoir en commun avec Rostand? Quel rapport peut-il y avoir entre la fantaisie poétique de Rostand et le réalisme brutal de l'auteur d'*Amoureuse*?

<sup>1</sup> Dans sa récente thèse: "*Georges de Porto-Riche, sa vie, son œuvre.*" Paris, Droz, 1934, Hendrick Brugmans ne cite pas Rostand quand il étudie "l'influence de Porto-Riche, sa place dans le mouvement dramatique qui prendra forme aux environs de 1895" (p. 234).

La réponse est simple : *Amoureuse, Le Passé, Le Vieil Homme* ont fait oublier les œuvres antérieures, et ce n'est pas sans surprise qu'on lit *Un drame sous Philippe II*, pièce toute nourrie de Hugo et Sardou, si inattendue sous la plume de Porto-Riche que Antoine lui-même, quand l'auteur, jeune encore, lui apportait sa *Chance de Françoise*, écrite seulement treize ans plus tard, le prenait pour le fils de l'auteur du *Drame sous Philippe II*. Qui se rappelle aujourd'hui *Les deux fautes* qui semblent un mauvais pastiche d'Alexandre Dumas fils ? Et qui se rappelle qu'entre sa première pièce vraiment portorichienne, *La Chance de Françoise*, et la pièce dont il voulait que le nom fût gravé sur sa tombe : *Amoureuse*, il avait fait jouer *L'Infidèle*, en vers, pièce publiée plus tard entre ces deux œuvres dans son "Théâtre d'Amour" ?

C'est en 1890 que Porto-Riche fait jouer au Théâtre d'Application *L'Infidèle* qui choque le public par ses crudités, mais qui remporte un gros succès, et qui sera repris six fois avant d'être reçu à la Comédie Française en 1923. En voici le sujet :

Vanina aime le poète Renato qui part pour accompagner en Espagne la filleule du Doge. Elle sent qu'elle a perdu son amour, et Lazzaro le peintre bohème conseille à Vanina de se venger de Renato en le trompant. Vanina veut retenir son amant par la jalousie et lui dit que tous les soirs un amoureux vient chanter sous sa fenêtre. Renato y vient la nuit et trouve Vanina déguisée en homme chantant sous sa propre fenêtre. Les épées se croisent, Renato tue Vanina avant de la reconnaître.

Cette fantaisie vénitienne semble bien oubliée aujourd'hui, mais il est impossible de la lire sans que des vers de Rostand vous viennent en foule à l'esprit : musique des *Romanesques*, visions méditerranéennes de *La Princesse Lointaine*, fantaisie pittoresque de *Cyrano*. N'avons-nous pas lu les vers qui suivent dans *Cyrano* ?

Hélas ! ta peine et ta beauté  
 Ont fait d'un puits de vin sortir la Vérité. (*L'Infidèle*, sc. 2)  
 J'avais dans mon pourpoint les sonnets de Ronsard,  
 Et la balle d'un gueux, hasard ou préférence,  
 Tomba sur les quatrains du poète de France.  
 Le soldat fut sauvé par un livre de vers. (sc. 3)  
 Voler un inconnu, c'est ne voler personne. (sc. 4)  
 Personne. Rien d'humain, hormis mon beau physique  
 Caressé par le flot, la lune et la musique. (sc. 6)

Quelquefois c'est un long passage qui rappelle—ou mieux, qui annonce—plusieurs "motifs" de *Cyrano* :

J'entreprends à minuit mon voyage pédestre,  
 Suivi d'un échanton, précédé d'un orchestre.  
 Car après chaque étape, aux accents d'un concert,  
 Je boirai lentement, comme un vin de dessert,  
 Le lacryma-christi que parmi mes commandes  
 J'avais pris pour pousser quelques gâteaux d'amandes.

Vanina

L'as-tu payé, ce vin?

Lazzaro

Innocente! J'ai dit

Que j'étais amoureux et l'on m'a fait crédit. (sc. 5)

C'est du Rostand tout pur, moins la poésie.

N'est-ce pas des *Romanesques* que nous viennent ces vers:

Je pince volontiers un doux andantino,  
 J'appris avec Henri de Valderrabano. (sc. 2)

Masque noir, grand manteau, rapière et mandoline. (sc. 8)

N'avons-nous pas comme un écho de *La Princesse Loïntaine* dans:

Ta galère est à l'ancre et les brises mutines  
 Ne gonflent pas encore ses deux voiles latines. (sc. 3)

J'ai vu le galion ancré près du rivage;  
 Vers minuit, tout à l'heure, il appareillera. (sc. 1)

La molle Adriatique est pure comme un lac;  
 L'équipage pourra dormir sur le tillac.  
 Et les oiseaux voiliers viendront par ribambelle  
 Tourner autour des mâts. (sc. 1)

C'est le ton, c'est la couleur, si ce n'est pas le vers de Rostand, sans qu'on puisse cependant parler d'imitation. Mais il y a dans *L'Infidèle* de nombreux autres passages que Rostand semble vraiment avoir imités, consciemment ou non. C'est dans *Cyrano* que nous trouverons la plus grande partie de ces rappels:

Oh! qui me donnera des mots pour t'adorer?

(*Inf.*, sc. 2)

dit Lazzaro à Vanina, et ce vers semble déclencher la grande tirade de Cyrano à Roxane qui lui demande:

Quels mots me direz-vous?

Tous ceux, tous ceux, tous ceux

Qui me viendront, je vais vous les jeter, en touffe,  
 Sans les mettre en bouquet: je vous aime, j'étouffe,  
 Je t'aime, je suis fou, . . .

(*Cyr.*, III, 6)



et dans cette même scène du balcon une image gracieuse bien connue en rappelle une autre moins connue :

Un page, beau garçon,  
Sous ma fenêtre, ici, murmure une chanson,  
Qui monte jusqu'à moi, roulée en arabesque,  
Pareille au liseron de ce balcon mauresque, (Inf., sc. 3)

dit Vanina . . . et Cyrano :

car j'ai senti, que tu le veuilles  
Ou non, le tremblement adoré de ta main  
Descendre tout le long des branches du jasmin. (Cyr., III, 6)

La scène 11 de l'acte III où Cyrano retient de Guiche à la porte de Roxane en lui racontant son voyage dans la lune est un développement du vers de Roxane :

Vous, *retenez* ici de Guiche ! Il va venir ! (Cyr., III, 6)

et aussi du vers de Renato :

Tu veux me *retenir*, conteuse de romans. (Inf., sc. 3)

Quelquefois c'est une rime :

Avant tout je suis pleutre.  
Ne guettez pas ce soir la plume de mon feutre, (Inf., sc. 5)

dit Lazzaro, et la rime est familière à qui se rappelle la " Ballade du duel qu'en l'hôtel bourguignon Monsieur de Bergerac eut avec un bélièvre." Quelquefois c'est un hémistiche :

Je n'ai que du talent, le Tasse a du génie, (Inf., sc. 3)

dit Renato. Cyrano dira :

Molière a du génie et Christian était beau. (Cyr., V, 6)

Les souvenirs portorichiens apparaissent avant Cyrano : Le héros de *L'Infidèle*, Renato, est un poète comme Joffroy Rudel de *La Princesse Lointaine* (et Cyrano) ; et de même que Bertrand récitera à la Princesse les vers de son ami Rudel, pour attendre celle-ci sur le sort du poète, Lazzaro récite à Vanina les vers de son ami Renato (Inf., sc. 2) précisément dans la même intention.

N'est-ce pas le sujet même de *La Princesse Lointaine* que nous trouvons dans ces vers de Lazzaro ?

Faire souffrir un homme, ah! c'est si bon, ma caille,  
C'est si bon d'avilir un cerveau qui travaille,  
De changer en ivrogne, en brute, en *assassin*  
*L'artiste* qui viendra dormir sur votre sein! (Inf., sc. 2)

N'est-ce pas l'illustration de ces vers que nous trouvons dans le rôle de Mélissinde et dans sa tirade qui se termine par:

Quelle est celle de nous qui ne serait, enfin,  
Heureuse de tenir en ses bras un Oreste  
Dont le Pylade meurt, qui le sait,—et qui reste! (III, 6)

Et si nous remontons jusqu'aux *Romanesques*, ce vers de *L'Infidèle*:

Mais tu n'écoutes pas.  
J'écoutais *votre voix*;  
Le rossignol *chantait* et j'étais dans les bois, (Inf., sc. 2)

ne semble-t-il pas vraiment être le thème sur lequel Sylvette brodera ses tendres mots:

Oui, ces vers sont très beaux, et le divin murmure  
*Les accompagne bien, c'est vrai, de la ramure,*  
*Et le décor leur sied, de ces ombrages verts;*  
Mais ce qui fait pour moi leur beauté plus touchante,  
C'est que vous les lisez de *votre voix* qui chante.  
(Rom. I, 1)

Plus loin dans la même pièce nous trouvons encore des images et des mots, plus banals il est vrai, groupés dans le même ordre que dans *L'Infidèle*: Vanina dit dans les tout premiers vers de la pièce:

Le jour meurt, *Vénus* monte à côté de *Cynthia*  
Voici la nuit qui vient. (Inf., sc. 1)

Percinet dira:

Mon premier rendez-vous, le soir . . .  
Oh! ce grand arbre, avec une étoile à son faite!  
*La nuit s'est faite. . .*  
Les étoiles vont en nombre croissant  
Tout autour, autour du grêle croissant  
De la pâle lune! (Rom., I, 9)

Et enfin la première nuit d'amour de Vanina:

Renato: Oui, la nuit sera belle.  
Vanina: Moins belle, ô Renato, que celle où Vanina,  
En fuyant de Trieste, à vous s'abandonna!  
Ce soir-là, notre barque errait toute argentée,  
La lagune berçait Venise reflétée, (Inf., sc. 1)

n'est-elle pas une de celles auxquelles pense Straforel quand il nous décrit l'enlèvement romantique:

Vénitien, en gondole,—il faudrait la lagune!—

L'enlèvement avec ou sans le clair de lune. (Rom, I, 5)

Je m'arrête ici : toutes ces citations ne sont peut-être pas également frappantes : quelques-unes ne sont probablement pas des imitations, d'autres sont à peine des rencontres ; mais, si individuellement elles n'ont pas toutes la même valeur, le fait même qu'elles sont si nombreuses n'en reste pas moins assez impressionnant, surtout si l'on songe qu'elles sont toutes empruntées à une courte pièce, en un acte, qui semble contenir à elle seule autant de passages évoquant l'œuvre de Rostand que toutes les œuvres réunies de tous les auteurs toujours cités comme ses maîtres et modèles.<sup>2</sup> J'ajouterai que le vers de Porto-Riche est beaucoup plus voisin du vers de Rostand, qui bien entendu le parera de son lyrisme scintillant, que le vers des autres contemporains si souvent mentionnés. Et il se trouve que Porto-Riche, écrivain en prose, brutal et cynique, est probablement un des derniers auteurs que l'on penserait à rapprocher de Rostand.<sup>3</sup>

La rencontre de nos deux auteurs n'a d'ailleurs rien de surprenant : Rostand a certainement vu *L'Infidèle*, à la création, ou à une des nombreuses reprises, ne serait-ce qu'à celle de 1895, au Théâtre de la Renaissance, sous la direction de Sarah Bernhardt. N'oublions pas en effet que c'est à ce Théâtre, quelques semaines après cette reprise, que fût jouée pour la première fois *La Princesse Lointaine*, dans laquelle Sarah créait le rôle de Mélissinde. Quoi d'étonnant si nous entendons dans la *Princesse* et plus tard dans *Cyrano* quelques échos de *L'Infidèle* ?

RENÉ TALAMON

University of Michigan

---

<sup>2</sup> Il est évidemment nourri de Musset et de Hugo, comme Porto-Riche d'ailleurs ; mais les passages directement inspirés sont en somme peu nombreux. A Banville, que l'on cite toujours, il est redevable en grande partie de la fantaisie de son vers, mais tout ce qu'il lui a emprunté se trouve dans son œuvre de jeunesse : *Les deux Pierrots*. A Coppée il semble avoir emprunté quelques passages surtout pour *Cyrano*, *L'Aiglon* et *Chantecler*.

<sup>3</sup> " Mais la littérature dramatique de la seconde moitié, voire de la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, n'a-t-elle pas puissamment contribué, elle aussi à la formation du talent de notre auteur ? Dumas fils, Augier et Sardou ? Puis Henry Becque et toute la comédie rosse ? Le Théâtre Libre et le théâtre de l'Œuvre ? . . . A la vérité tout cela semble n'avoir guère existé pour M. Rostand " (Jules Haraszti : *Edmond Rostand*, Paris, 1913, p. 77),

## NEW SONGS OF THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII

The songs that follow, taken from MS. Ashmole 176 in the Bodleian Library, should be added to the not very extensive *corpus* of pieces by the courtiers and professional musicians of Henry VIII's court.<sup>1</sup>

## I

I can be wanton *and* yf I wyl, but yf youe touche me I wyll crye howe  
 I can be merye *and* thinke no evell, but yet beware one cometh I trowe  
 Yf any come in faith I crye, *that* all the strete my voyce shall heare  
 take hede that no *man* doe youe espye, *and* I then warant youe come  
 verye nye  
 But yf youe come syt farre from me for me semeth youe should be wylde  
 and by suche wanton men as youe be yonge maydes are sometymes begyled  
 I wilbe ware of suche lyke wylde men for when they touche me I doe  
 crye howe

---

<sup>1</sup> The contents of the MS. (a small pamphlet written in a hand of the second half of the 16th cent., in a volume of miscellaneous contents) is as follows: 1. "Yf care may cause mē crye whye doe I not cōplaine" (fol. 97<sup>r-v</sup>). A copy, with many variations, of Surrey's poem in *Tottel's Miscellany* (ed. Rollins, I, 209). 2. An erotic song of six stanzas (fol. 98), beginning:

My Ladye hathe forsaken me that longe hathe bene her mā  
 yet she her selfe retayned me and covenūt[sic] first beganne  
 But nowe I haue espyed some other she hathe tryed  
 Lustye and full of strength in Labor good at Lengthe

3. "vp I arose, in verno tempore, & found a mayd, sub quadā arbore" (fol. 98<sup>v</sup>). Printed from MS. Add. 5665, fols. 145<sup>v</sup>-146, in *Archiv*, CVI, 284.  
 4. No. I, below (fol. 98<sup>v</sup>). 5. "Let be wanton yor Busynes for in good faith youe are to blame" (fol. 98<sup>v</sup>). An erotic song of two lines (or one stanza of four). 6-13. Nos. II-IX, below (fols. 99-100). 14. "Adew adewe my hartes lust" (fol. 100). By William Cornish. Printed from MS. Add. 31922, fols. 23<sup>v</sup>-24, in *Anglia*, XII, 232. 15. No. X, below (fol. 100). 16. "Come over the borne bessye" (fol. 100). Printed from MS. 5665, fols. 143<sup>v</sup>-4, by H. B. Briggs, *Madrigals by English Composers of the Close of the Fifteenth Century* (1893), no. 2; see also Rollins, *Analytical Index*, No. 587. 17. No. XI, below (fol. 100<sup>v</sup>). Previously printed in Miss Helen Sandison's "Chanson d'Aventure" in *Middle English* (1913), pp. 100-101 (where "the" in l. 8 is omitted, and "which" is misprinted "With" in l. 13). 18. "Ravyshed was I that well was me" (fols. 100<sup>v</sup>-101). A song on the Princess Mary's dancing with her father, printed in Wright and Halliwell, *Reliquæ Antiquæ*, I, 258.

kysse me ye should, I beshrewe me then by crist not for my mothers  
blacke cowe

ye may me kyll as soone as kysse, I pray you awaie *and* let me be  
in faith all the world wyll speake of this, I say ye play *the* foole with me

By god I strike youe with my fyste I shall make your cap fall on the flower  
But for all that doe what youe Lyst, *and* I wilbe styll *and* crye howe  
no more/

fynis/

## II

Lost ys my Love farewell adewe lost ys my love farewell adewe  
I see the prooffe she wyll not be true lost ys my love farewell adewe

## III

Though ye my love were<sup>a</sup> a ladye fayr  
passing all other in bewtye to ensue  
Should your false love cause me to dispaire  
nay my Love nay farewell adewe

Sometyme to me youe were right kinde  
and nowe to me youe be vntrue  
Should I therfore beare sorrowe in mynd  
nay my Love nay farewell adewe

Should these faire wordes *and* swete countenance  
cause me to encline towards youe  
except I knowe a better assurance  
nay my Love nay farewell adewe /

finis

## IV

Alas myne eye whye doest *thou* bringe  
allwayes my hart in payne *and* woe  
Sythe thoue me rulest in everye thing  
whye art thou thus my mortall foe/

## V

Adewe pleasure welcome mornynge, alas all payne nowe ys my *part*  
for I see well *that* my sweting doth not consyder my true hart/

## VI<sup>a</sup>

Ah my hart ah this ys my Songe with weping eis nowe *and* then among  
opprest with paynfull Sighe stronge that ah my hart ah  
And where as I should haue redresse I fynde no poynt of gentlenes  
but ever rewarded with vnkyndnes that ah my hart ah

<sup>a</sup> MS. *were were*.

<sup>a</sup> This song is mentioned in the *Complaynt of Scotland* (E. E. T. S., Extra Ser., xvii, 65) as "O myne hart hay this is my sang," and a spiritual

I see of love she *can* no skylle *and* yet nedes must I love her stylle  
 for I cannot withdrawe my goodwyll that ah my hart ah  
 Alas alas the more ys my payne she lacketh pytye or elles disdayne  
 To muche in her yt dothe remayne that ah my hart ah

She hath reclaymed me to her lure I haue *the* payne *and* she *the* pleasure  
 regarding not what woe I endure that ah my hart ah  
 Thus comfortles I am alway were I not better dye a great ney  
 yes yes hardelye come deathe I the pray that ah my hart ah/

All trewe Lovers pray for me *that* my Swete hart may haue pytye  
 or elles wyll death be myne extremitye that ah my hart ah

fynis

## VII

Sauns remedye endure must I in paynes deadly for my mistres  
 onlesse *that* she doe me petye of her bountye *and* great goodnes  
 I may complayne as one in payne yea of certayne *and* noblelease  
 thus morne I may in paynes allway, both nyght *and* day in great distres  
 Trowe youe *that* I can Slepe nyghtlye nay nay hardelye I am so afrayd  
 I turne I typ, I sighe I wepe, I call I clepe to venus for ayde  
 I dare not name howe fonde I *am*, for verye shame by god above  
 some *men* would trowe to make me a doe *that* doe not knowe the paynes  
 of love

Therefore mistres let see expresse some gentlenes for love I call  
 for doutles ye may reclayme me and no paynes be to youe at all  
 Or elles trulye endure must I in paynes deadly for my mystres  
 alas *that* she doth not petye of her bountye *and* great goodnes  
 finis/

## VIII

Parting parting I may well synge hath caused all my payne  
 from her to part yt greveth my hart, ye wot not whom I meane

parody of it is in the *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, 1567 (Scottish Text Soc., 1897, 139-140), beginning:

All[sic] my hart ay this is my sang,  
 With doubill myrth and ioy amang,  
 Sa blyith as byrd my God to fang,  
 Christ hes my hart ay.

The refrain is reminiscent of that of Wyatt's song (ed. Foxwell, I, 323), beginning:

A! my herte, a! what aileth the  
 To sett so light my libertye,  
 Making me bonde when I was fre.  
 A! my herte a! what aileth thee.

A most fayre *and* true ye cause me rue your absence ys my payne  
 yet youe to Love by god above I cannot me refreyn  
 for ye were she which comforted me *and* made me mery *and* glad  
 for your kynd resort dyd me comfort when I was heavy *and* Sad  
 wherfore Swete hart thoughe I should smart *and* great paynes long endure  
 of my poore Love by god above ye shalbe ever sure

f[i]n[i]s/

IX

Alas to whom should I complayne or shewe my wofull heavynes  
 syth fortune hathe me in disdayne, *and* am exyled remedylesse/

X

O what a treasure ys love certeyne when hertes be sped *and* cannot refrayne  
 my ladye loveth me well my ioy no tong can tell in her ys petye *and* no  
 disdayne

XI

This nyghtes rest this nyghtes rest, adewe farewell this nightes rest  
 In a garden vnderneath a tree, together *the* floures *that* grewe therbye  
 walking alone I dyd espye a man in paynes that was prest,  
 and sorowfullye thus could he crye adewe farewell this nyghtes rest/

I mervayled what this man dyd meane his teares ran downe all from his eyes  
 that he had lost his colour cleane a carefull crye then vp he cast  
 that I might see that I haue seene adewe farewell this nyghtes rest

I asked hym the questyon why *that* he lay there all pytyouslye  
 he said goe hence *and* Let me Lye my dolor cannot be redrest  
 for above all other yet cause haue I to sey farewell this nyghtes rest

for gone away ys all my gladnes *and* come nowe ys my heavynes  
 thus I am lefte alone helpelesse and must forbear *that* I love best  
 which no man can I trowe redresse wherfore adewe this nyghtes rest

And yet farewell *that* creature *that* hathe my hart wofull in cure  
 for whom I must so endure yet her to please I would be prest  
 she hathe reclaymed me to her Lure to say farewell this nyghtes rest

Thus am I left alone *and* governor here haue I none  
 nor wot to whom to make my mone for there ys none *that* I dare trust  
 I can no more but ever one adewe farewell this nyghtes rest

finis/

BERNARD M. WAGNER

Georgetown University

## SAINT-AMANT AS "PREROMANTIC"

In his searching analysis of the "Dryden-Tonson" and Dodsley Miscellanies, Professor Havens has called attention to a remarkable anonymous poem "On Solitude" which appeared in the 1716 revision (I, 261-67) of the earlier anthology; "though its style suggests the first quarter of the seventeenth century, [it] may have been written a hundred years later."<sup>1</sup> The lively interest in wild nature, in ruins, in the sea, in the "graveyard school" paraphernalia which includes the "Carcass" of one who hanged himself for love, seems strangely out of order in 1716.

The poem is a very close rendering of Saint-Amant's *La Solitude* (1617 or 1618), much closer than Fairfax's *The Solitude*<sup>2</sup> (date unknown) which omits five stanzas of the original and transposes another.<sup>3</sup> This translator follows the French stanza by stanza with accuracy and some felicity. The following is a representative specimen:

Que c'est une chose agreable  
D'estre sur le bord de la mer,  
Quand elle vient à se calmer  
Après quelque orage effroyable!  
Et que les chevelus Tritons,  
Hauts, sur les vagues secouées,  
Frapent les airs d'estranges tons  
Avec leurs trompes enrouées,  
Dont l'eclat rend respectueux  
Les vents les plus impetueux.<sup>4</sup>  
How highly is the Fancy pleas'd,  
To be upon the Ocean's Shore,  
When she begins to be appeas'd,  
And her fierce Billows cease to roar!  
And when the hairy Tritons are  
Riding upon the shaken Wave,  
With what strange sound they strike the Air,  
Of their Trumpets hoarse and brave,

<sup>1</sup> R. D. Havens, "Changing Taste in the Eighteenth Century. A Study of Dryden's and Dodsley's Miscellanies," *PMLA.*, XLIV (1929), 514.

<sup>2</sup> Clements R. Markham, *A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, London, 1870, pp. 419-23.

<sup>3</sup> See Geoffrey Woledge, "Saint Amand, Fairfax and Marvell," *MLR.*, XXV (1930), 482.

<sup>4</sup> *Œuvres Poétiques de Saint-Amant*, ed. Léon Vérane, Paris, 1930, p. 7.



Whose shrill Report, does every wind  
Unto his due submission bind! \*

Here is additional evidence of the Augustan taste for early seventeenth-century poetry.

ROBERT A. AUBIN

*Harvard University*

# SOME ADDITIONS TO THE POEMS OF LORD DORSET

By providing a "Checklist of the Poems of Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset and Middlesex,"<sup>1</sup> Miss Helen A. Bagley has filled a long-standing need and earned the thanks of those to whom his contemporary reputation is a puzzle. It is possible, however, to supplement her researches and carry the work a little further. The completest collection of Dorset's poems before that for which Johnson wrote the preface was apparently in *The Works of the Most Celebrated Minor Poets*, 1749, vols. I and III, not noticed by Miss Bagley.<sup>2</sup> This contains all the poems in her list, with the exception of "The Duel of the Crabs" ("In Milford-Lane, near to St. Clement's steeple"), "Poem, by a Person of Honour" ("Though, Phyllis, your prevailing charms"), "Song" ("Corydon beneath a willow"), "The Antiquated Coquet" ("Phyllis if you will not agree"), and "The fire of love in youthful blood." Next, *The Works of Celebrated Authors*, 1750, vol. I,<sup>3</sup> includes all the pieces of 1749 except two: "A Faithful Catalogue of our Most Eminent Ninnies" ("Curs'd be these dull, unpointed, doggrel Rhimes") and "On Dolly Chamberlain" ("Dolly's beauty and art"). These are, significantly, also omitted by the Johnson edition, and there is reason to think that by 1750 some doubt was cast on their authorship.<sup>4</sup>

\* "Dryden's Miscellany," edition of 1716, I, 265. The piece was reprinted in John Nichols's *Select Collection of Poems*, I (1780), 130-38.

<sup>1</sup> *MLN.*, XLVII (November, 1932), 454-461.

<sup>2</sup> British Museum, press-mark 238. c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> British Museum, press-mark 238. g. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Seemingly no collection reprints the song,

In vain, Clemene, you bestow  
The promised empire of your heart, etc.,

said by A. H. Bullen in his *Musa Proterva*, 1902, p. 40, to have been contributed to Southerne's *Sir Antony Love*, 1691.

From a search of British Museum manuscripts, made in 1931, I am able to add to the canon. One of the printed poems, "On a Lady who Fancy'd Herself a Beauty" ("Dorinda's sparkling wit and eyes") is found also in MS. Lansdowne 852 on folio 113, where it has four stanzas, and in Harleian 7315, f. 234. The Lansdowne MS. (? 1725) contains other poems of Dorset. At f. 61 is one entitled "On M<sup>rs</sup>: Roche By My L<sup>d</sup>: Dorset found among his Papers after his Death" — of which, however, a better and apparently earlier text is in Additional 40060 at 66<sup>b</sup>, styled "A Prophecy by the E of Dorset found amongst his papers upon M<sup>rs</sup> Roch having been contracted in Ireland and the Match after broke off." As the compilation of this manuscript book was begun, if one may judge by a note inside the cover, on "Nov. y<sup>e</sup> 17<sup>th</sup>, 1701," these verses must have been transcribed soon after the Earl's death. They have a peculiar interest, in that, according to the *DNB.*, Dorset married, as his third wife, on 27 August, 1704, "Anne, 'Mrs. Roche,' a 'woman of obscure connections.'"

Like a true Irish Merlyn that misses her flight  
 Little Nanny lies sullen and Peevish all night  
 Tho the Iack-daw has scap't her the losse is not great  
 She may yett catch a Woodcock, and that's better meat.<sup>5</sup>

On f. 84 of the same manuscript is "A Ballad made by the Late Earl of Dorset, Adapted to the Present Time," with date March 17<sup>10</sup>/<sub>11</sub>. It is a renovation of the famous "To all you ladies now at land." A longer unpublished piece of Dorset's occurs in Stowe 970, f. 45, a scurrilous verse-letter, perhaps addressed to Moll Howard. Could the "Lady N—" who is its subject possibly be the eccentric Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle?

#### MY LORD DORSETS VERSES ON LADY N—

Courage Dear Moll, and drive away dispair  
 Mopsa who in her youth was ne're thought fair  
 in spite of age, experience & decay  
 sets up for Charming in the fading day  
 shoots her demy Eyes to give one parting Blow  
 have at the heart of every Ogling Beau  
 this Goodly goose all featherd like a Jay

---

<sup>5</sup> Variants in Lansdowne 852 are: 1. true : right; misses : has lost  
 2. Poor Nancy lay pensive and Sighing 3. Iack-daw has scap't : Jack-  
 Daws escap'd 4. may catch

so gaudy looks, & so demurely gay  
 last night so grave the Court did over load  
 her bald Buff forehead wth a high Commode  
 her steps were managed wth such tender art  
 As if each board had been a lovers heart  
 In all her air, in every glance was seen  
 a mixture strange twixt fifty and fifteen  
 Crowds of admiring fops about her press  
 Hamden himself delivers the address  
 fair Queen of fopland is her Royall stile  
 (fopland the largest part, of this large Isle)  
 Nature did ne're more equally devide  
 a female heart twixt piety and pride  
 her watchfull maids prevents the break of day  
 and all in order on her Twoilet lay  
 prayer book, & patches, Sermon, notes, & paint  
 at once to adorn the sinner & the Saint  
 fair well freind Moll, expect no more from me  
 you'le find her some where in the Littany  
 with Pride, vain Glory, & Hyprocrisie

The following pieces, of which I have, unfortunately, no copies, are attributed in manuscripts to Dorset:—

1. "Dorset's Lamentation for Moll Howard's absence" ("Dorset no gentle nymph can find"), Harleian 6914, f. 47b, Harleian 7319 (a manuscript dated 1682), f. 103. (Probably not by Dorset).
2. "A Hugh and Cry after Fair Amoret 1696" (Fair Amoret is gone astray"), Harleian 7315, f. 243b, Lansdowne 852, f. 115. (Printed as Congreve's in his *Poems upon Several Occasions*, 1710).
3. "My Opinion" ("After thinking this fortnight of Whig and of Tory"), Harleian 7319, f. 103b.
4. "Old Simon ye King" ("This making of Bastards great"), Harleian 7319, f. 155b.\*

Perhaps some future editor will subject these attributions to severe critical examination and give us finally a complete text of Dorset's poems.

R. G. HOWARTH

*The University of Sydney*

---

\* There is another poem on f. 371.

## A RESTORATION "IMPROVEMENT" OF THOMAS DEKKER

The fact seems not to have been noted that Dekker's pamphlet *News from Hell* (1606), revised by him and published in the following year as *A Knights Coniuring Done in Earnest: Discovered in Iest*,<sup>1</sup> underwent a second revision seventy years later at the hands of some one else. This version of Dekker's satire, a little octavo volume which I have seen only in the British Museum, bears the title *Poor Robin's Visions: Wherein is Described, The present Humours of the Times; the Vices and Fashionable Fopperies thereof; And after what manner Men are Punished for them hereafter*.<sup>2</sup> The unknown plagiarist,<sup>3</sup> seeing the resemblance between Dekker's Lucianic satire and the racy version of Quevedo's *Sueños* made by Sir Roger L'Estrange ten years earlier, hoped obviously to capitalize upon the popularity of the latter book.<sup>4</sup>

At the beginning the volume offers an almost exact reproduction of Dekker's text, but soon the "author" modifies the old-fashioned original in various ways, paraphrasing, omitting, and supplementing freely and not always for the worse. Dekker's third chapter

<sup>1</sup> *Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature*, ed. E. F. Rimbault, Percy Society, London, 1842, vol. v.

<sup>2</sup> *Licensed May 17. 1677. Roger L'Estrange. London, Printed for, and sold by Arthur Boldero . . . 1677.* Listed anonymously in W. C. Hazlitt's *Collections and Notes 1867-1876*, London, 1876, p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Sidney Lee in his article on Robert Winstanly in *DNB*, attributes this pamphlet to that author, on the grounds, no doubt, that the man who in his opinion wrote the almanacs of "Poor Robin" must have written *Poor Robin's Visions* too. But, in the first place, there is some uncertainty as to the authorship of the long series of almanacs (see *Notes and Queries*, 6th series, VII [1883], 321-322) and even more as to the authorship of *Poor Robin's Intelligence*, 1676-1677, and of several single-sheet satires, called *Poor Robin's Memoirs*, published in December, 1677 (Bagford collection, Harl. 5958, in the British Museum). Secondly, there is no striking resemblance in style between the almanacs and the original portions of *Poor Robin's Visions*. And finally, I see no reason to prevent our supposing that the man who stole the major part of the contents of his book stole his title also.

<sup>4</sup> L'Estrange's *The Visions of Dom Francisco de Quevedo Villegas*, 1667, had reached a "Fifth Edition" in 1673. The considerable vogue in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of satiric communications with, and pictures of, the nether world I shall treat elsewhere.

and part of the fourth are omitted, as are the passage on the usurer in Chapter Six<sup>5</sup> and many references to Elizabethan authors in the ninth chapter. One quotation will serve to illustrate the quality of the revision as well as the carelessness with which the volume was printed.

*Charon* having just discharged his freight; I cry'd a *Boat*, a *Boat*; for I was unwilling to go over with such a crowd of miserable sad Souls. My voice being heard by this Skuller, although he was very weary; over he came; As soon as I was well seated, *Charon* began to complain what a bawling there has been, with what fares he has been posted, and how with much tugging (his Boat being so thwack the has split one of his Oars; and broke his Boat-hook, so that he can row but slowly till it be mended. And were it not that the Souls pay excessive rents for dwelling in the body, he swore by the *Stygian Lake*, he would not let them pass thus for a trifle, but raise his price; *why may not he do it, as well as fine Misses their rotten Commodities?*<sup>6</sup>

Although Dekker's style in this pamphlet was extravagant enough, that of *Poor Robin's Visions* is not only fantastic but facetious and gross in addition. Especially is this characteristic notable in the original portions. And not without cause. For in the seventh Vision, which is entirely new, and in the eighth, which adds a great deal to a brief use of Dekker's ninth chapter, there are quite obvious imitations of the Quevedo-L'Estrange visions of corruption on earth and in hell. The noisy, busy scenes of folly and vice and the equally strong and lively language of the L'Estrange volume are approximated more successfully in the seventh Vision than elsewhere. Nor is the combination of Dekker modernized and L'Estrange imitated disharmonious. It is, however, the vitality of Dekker's writing which furnishes the book its force.

BENJAMIN BOYCE

*Municipal University of Omaha*

---

<sup>5</sup> Ed. Rimbault, pp. 53-61.

<sup>6</sup> *Poor Robin's Visions*, pp. 45-46. Compare Rimbault, p. 43.

## HAKEWILL AND THE ARTHURIAN LEGEND

An oversight of some importance in Professor R. F. Brinkley's *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, 1932) is the omission of Dr. George Hakewill, than whom not even the esteemed Selden was more overwhelming in his doubt of the Trojan origin. In the *Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Gouvernement of the World* (1627), which is "an examination and censure of the common error touching Natures perpetuall and universall decay," Hakewill considers "diverse other opinions justly suspected if not rejected, though commonly received," among which he displays this one:

That *Brute* a *Trojan* by Nation, and great grandchild to *Aeneas*, arrived in this Iland, gave it the name of *Brittaine* from himselfe, heere reigned, and left the government thereof divided among his three sonnes, *England* to *Loegrius*, *Scotland* to *Albanak*, and *Wales* to *Camber*: Yet our great *Antiquary*\* beating (as he professeth) his braines, & bending the force of his wits to maintaine that opinion, hee found no warrantable ground for it. Nay by forcible arguments (produced as in the person of others disputing against himself) he strongly proves it (in my judgement) altogether unsound & unwarrantable. *Boccace*, *Adrianus Iunius*, *Polydorus*, *Buchanan*, *Vignier*, *Genebrard*, *Molinaeus*, *Bodin*, and other Writers of great account, are all of opinion, there was no such man as this supposed *Brute*: And among our own ancient Chroniclers, *John of Wethamsted*, *Abbot of S. Alban*,† holdeth the whole narration of *Brute* to have been rather Poeticall, then Historically, which me thinkes is agreeable to reason, since *Caesar*, *Tacitus*, *Gildas*, *Ninius*, *Bede*, *William of Malmesbery*, and as many others as have written any thing touching our Countrey, before the yeare 1160, made no mention at all of him, nor seeme ever so much as to have heard of him. The first that ever broached it, was *Geffrey of Monmouth*, about foure hundred yeares agoe, during the raigne of *Henry* the second, who publishing the *Brittish* story in Latine, pretended to have taken out of ancient monuments written in the *Brittish* tongue: but this Booke as soone as it peeped forth into the light, was sharply censured both by *Giraldus Cambrensis*, and *William of Newbery*, who lived at the same time; the former terming it no better, then *Fabulosam historiam*, a fabulous history; and the latter, *ridicula figmenta*, ridiculous fictions, and it now stands branded with a black coale among the bookes prohibited by the Church of Rome.<sup>1</sup>

\* *Camden: Britan: de primis Incolis.* † *In granario, Anno 1440.*

<sup>1</sup> *The 3d Edition much Enlarged* (London, 1635), p. 9. Previously printed in 1627 and 1630; I have not been able to consult these editions.

Although explicitly concerned with the Trojan origin, this also condemns the Arthurian matter at its source, and makes altogether a rather devastating résumé. Professor Brinkley's book provides many similar arguments, but perhaps none more strongly adverse, and none which leaves the British story exposed in a catalogue of vulgar errors.

Hakewill's *Apologie* supplied the thesis for disputation at the Cambridge Commencement of 1628, when Milton urged Hakewill's contention (borrowing his arguments) in a Latin poem, "Naturam non pati senium." But this is not the place to consider whether Milton eventually turned his energies from a poetic fiction so that he might combat the idea of "universal decay" by his own justification of the Providence of God. It is sufficient to remark that a mind which was so Jacobean as to draw up its own "Christian Doctrine" could not express itself in romance.

GEORGE WILLIAMSON

*University of Oregon*

## AN ATTRIBUTION TO SUCKLING

In *A Book of Seventeenth-Century Prose* (New York, 1929), the editors, R. P. T. Coffin and A. M. Witherspoon, ascribe to Suckling "A Sermon on Malt," to which they append this footnote: "This letter is on the back of fol. 102 of Ashm. MS. 826, Bodleian Library. It is here printed for the first time." If they mean that this version is here printed for the first time, they are probably right; but if they mean that this sermon on malt has not been printed before, they are mistaken. For John Ashton included it in his *Humour, Wit, & Satire of the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1884, p. 411), where it is reprinted from *Coffee House Jestes Refined and Enlarged* (London, 1686). This version, which is called *A Preachment on Malt*, offers a better text and makes good some of the points which are fumbled in the Coffin and Witherspoon book. In satiric effect the later reprint is also weakened by its abbreviation of the 'division' in the Jacobean sermon, which is being parodied.

As a sample of the superiority of the Ashton text, let me instance the opening lines. Where the Coffin and Witherspoon text reads

There is no teaching without division. This theme cannot well be divided into many parts, because it is but one word, nor yet into syllables, as being a monosyllable. It must therefore be quartered into four letters, and those being M. A. L. T. do form the word *malt*, my theme (p. 456)

the Ashton text reads

There is no preaching without Division, and this Text cannot well be divided into many parts, because it is but one word, nor into many Syllables, because it is but one Syllable. It must therefore be divided into Letters, and they are found to be four, *viz.* M. A. L. T. (p. 411).

Although the loss by abbreviation does not appear in this example, words like "teaching" and "theme" rather muff their points, and certainly the latter text, with its expert parallelism, is a better parody of the style of a preacher like Lancelot Andrewes.

The grounds for attributing this mock-sermon to Suckling or for calling it a "letter" are not given.

GEORGE WILLIAMSON

*University of Oregon*

#### EDITIONS OF PERCY'S MEMOIR OF GOLDSMITH

Because copies of Oliver Goldsmith's *Miscellaneous Works*, London, 1801, containing the important Memoir of Goldsmith prepared in large part by Thomas Percy, are not readily accessible, it seems desirable to correct the current misconception expressed by Miss Katherine C. Balderston in her *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith* (Cambridge University Press, 1926, p. 52) that here is to be found the "sole edition of the Memoir." On the contrary, this same life of Goldsmith appeared in at least six other editions of Goldsmith's *Miscellaneous Works*. Those published in London in 1806, 1812, and 1820 were, like the original edition of 1801, issued by a large group of booksellers associated for the purpose, the members of which varied somewhat through the years. The Boston reprint of 1809 was brought out by Hastings, Etheridge and Bliss and others; that published in Baltimore in the same year, by Coale and Thomas; and the Baltimore reprint of 1816, by F. Lucas, Jr. and Joseph Cushing. Probably there were still other editions, for Percy wrote Robert Ander-



son on May 24, 1808, that in addition to the *Miscellaneous Works* and Memoir of 1801 "two more elegant editions have been printed in London." He undoubtedly refers to the edition of 1806 and to some other which I have not discovered.

Two other editions of the *Miscellaneous Works* contain lives of Goldsmith which closely parallel the Percy Memoir but are not identical with it or with each other. One was "printed by and for R. Chapman" of Glasgow in 1816, the other in 1821 for a group of booksellers in London, Liverpool, York, Edinburgh, and Glasgow. The latter is of particular significance because it seems to be that to which Washington Irving refers in his life of Goldsmith, where he says in a footnote: "The present biography is principally taken from the Scotch edition of Goldsmith's works, published in 1821."

IRVING L. CHURCHILL

*Bucknell University*

## THE ORIGIN OF A BALLAD

Theories are still being formed in the controversy concerning the communal or individual authorship of ballads. The hopelessness of ever settling the question is seen in the misinformation gleaned from local sources concerning the lumberman ballad of "Jack Haggerty."

### JACK HAGGERTY

- 1 My name is Jack Haggerty, from Greenville I come,  
All pleasures departed, all joys I disdain;  
From the strong darts of Cupid, that gave me such grief,  
Till my heart breaks asunder I shall ne'er get relief.
- 2 My calling is rafting, where the Flat River rolls,  
My name is engraved on its rocks and sand shoals,  
Through shops, bars, and households it's very well known,  
They call me Jack Haggerty, the pride of the town.
- 3 I will tell you my troubles without more delay,  
How a sweet little lassie my heart stole away.  
She was a smith's daughter, on the Flat River side,  
And I always intended to make her my bride.
- 4 Her form like the dove was most slender and neat,  
And her hair hung in ringlets to her tiny white feet,  
Her voice was as clear as the nightingale's song,  
And it rang in my ears all the day and night long.

- 5 I dressed her in muslin, in silk, and in lace,  
In the costliest of jewels her hands I encased.  
I gave her my wages each month to keep safe,  
I begrudged her of nothing I had on the earth.
- 6 I took her to suppers, to parties, and balls,  
On Sunday, boat riding was the first early call,  
She said that she loved me as we strolled through the town,  
Her words sweet as music o'er the rise of the morn.
- 7 I worked on the river, I earned quite a stake,  
I was steadfast and steady, I ne'er played the rake,  
I was bouyant and happy on the boiling, white stream,  
My thoughts were of Anna — she haunted my dreams.
- 8 One day on the river a letter I received,  
She said from her promise herself would relieve,  
That her marriage to a loved one she had long time delayed,  
And the next time I saw her she would ne'er be a maid.
- 9 Her mother, Jane Tucker, was the one most to blame,  
She caused her to leave me, and blacken my name,  
She cast off the rigging that God would soon tie,  
And left me to wander, till the day that I die.
- 10 Farewell to Flat river, for me there's no rest,  
I'll shoulder my peavie and I will go west.  
I'll go to Muskegon, some comfort to find,  
And leave both Flat river and Anna behind.
- 11 Now all you bold raftsmen, kindhearted and true,  
Don't rely on a woman — you're beat if you do.  
And if ever you meet one with brown chestnut curls,  
Just think of Jack Haggerty and the Flat river girl.

While making a collection of ballads and folk-songs near Belding, Michigan, I heard of the "Jack Haggerty" song and of Anna Tucker, the heroine. Having learned that her son, William Mercer, lived in Greenville, near Belding, I interviewed him concerning the origin of the song. The details which he gave me were so different from those given in the song that I became interested in the problem and traced and interviewed the relatives of Anna Tucker and some of the older residents of Greenville.

I found that the people around Greenville have accepted as facts the details embodied in the song.

The relatives of Anna Tucker and some of the older residents, however, gave me an entirely different story. The most complete account was given me by Mr. Joseph L. Kitzmiller, now eighty-three years old, who married Anna's younger sister, Mary, in July

1873. He told me that Jack Haggerty worked for some time for a man by the name of Charley Wells who lived in the "upright" part of the Tucker home. Anna had never paid any special attention to Haggerty and had never "kept company" with him. Anna Tucker was born in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1856, and at the time this song was composed was the belle of Greenville. Her mother's name was Sarah, not "Jane" as given in the song. The Tucker home was on the main street of Greenville, almost on the bank of the Flat River. Across the street was the blacksmith shop of Anna's father. During the winter of 1872-3, Jack Haggerty, then about nineteen years old, worked in the same lumber camp with George Mercer, Anna's fiancé, and with Dan McGinnis, a red-haired, red-faced Irishman who had been educated for the priesthood. Mercer, who was almost ten years younger than McGinnis, was made foreman of the camp, and this made McGinnis and some of the other older men very jealous. They "got their heads together and composed this song"<sup>1</sup> and signed Jack Haggerty's name to it. McGinnis did not know Anna Tucker but knew that she was Mercer's fiancée and used this song as a means of hurting him.

Practically the same story was given by Mr. John Tucker, Anna's brother, three years younger than she. Mr. Tucker said that Jack Haggerty "wasn't smart enough to write" the song, but he did not say that McGinnis wrote it. Mr. Charles Finch, an old lumberman who worked in the woods with Haggerty and McGinnis, said that everyone in the camps understood that McGinnis had composed the song. Anna Tucker's son and daughter, William Mercer and Mrs. Nora Nichols, remembered the story of the song's origin told by their mother as being similar to that of Mr. Kitzmiller. Mr. C. L. Clark, the informant quoted in the notes of the collection by Franz Rickaby,<sup>2</sup> seems not to have told Mr. Rickaby that he had heard that Jack Haggerty did not compose the song.

<sup>1</sup> This hints at a somewhat communal origin of the song. McGinnis, however, seems to have been acknowledged generally as the "moving spirit" of the group, and is usually accepted as the sole author.

<sup>2</sup> Collector and editor of *Ballads and Songs of the Shanty-Boy* (Harvard University Press, 1926). Mr. Rickaby states in his Introduction, xxvii, "And it is more than likely that 'Jack Haggerty' is built upon fact of some sort, although the material presented in the Notes establishes with certainty only Jack's historicity."

He told me, however, that that idea rather spoiled the song for him, and he did not like to believe it. The information given to Mr. Rickaby by Mr. Clark differs greatly from that which he gave me, a fact which illustrates the unreliability of such information.

From this study of the origin of this song it seems most probable that Jack Haggerty did not compose nor was he directly responsible for the song which has borne his name throughout the United States and Canada.

GERALDINE J. CHICKERING

Wayne University

---

## REVIEWS

---

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL: *Neue philosophische Schriften*. Erstmals in Druck gelegt, erläutert und mit einer Einleitung in Fr. Schlegels philosophischen Entwicklungsgang versehen von JOSEF KÖRNER. Mit einer Faksimilereproduktion von Schlegels Habilitationsgesuch an die Universität Jena. Frankfurt a. M.: Gerhard Schulte-Bulmke, 1935. Pp. 393.

On January 12, 1929, one hundred years had elapsed since the death of Friedrich Schlegel, who may in a sense be called the father of German Romanticism. However, although scores of works have been written about "deutsche Romantik," especially during the last few decades, our knowledge of him, his ideas and his works has remained of a lamentably fragmentary nature. His so-called *Sämtliche Werke* are by no means complete, his various philosophical lectures edited by Windischmann and others are as fragmentary as his *Prosaische Jugendschriften* published by Minor, and his letters are known only in part even to scholars.

While others have written scintillating books on the subject, utilizing the partially available sources plus their own sometimes brilliant powers of imagination or combination, Josef Körner of Prague has for some thirty years been at work tracking down new sources. His remarkable success, in Treves, in the family of the Bonn professor J. W. J. Braun, in Coppet and elsewhere should be a matter of common knowledge by this time. But it would be equally desirable if more were known about the bitter disappointments and heart-breaking frustrations which have attended Körner's efforts to publish this veritable mountain of new material, which will do much to correct and adjust our views of the Schlegels and of Romanticism in general.

It redounds to the credit of the Frankfurt publisher Gerhard Schulte-Bulmke that he has made it possible for at least a small portion of this new matter to see the light of day. The items which Körner presents here are six in number, namely:

1. *Transcendentalphilosophie*. Transcription, by an anonymous student, of Schlegel's lectures at Jena during the winter semester of 1800-1801. Pp. 115-220. Purchased by Körner from the Leipzig dealer Gustav Fock in 1927.

2. *Skizze zu einem Vortrag über Philosophie für Frau von Staël*. Delivered during the winter of 1806-1807. Pp. 240-258. Now in the University Library of Bonn; a poor copy, chiefly by the hand of two of Schlegel's Cologne friends, J. B. Bertram and S. Boisserée. Schlegel's original seems lost.

3. A review of Jacobi's *Von den göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung* (1811) in *Deutsches Museum*, 1812. Pp. 263-278. Has been known only to a few Schlegel specialists.

4. *Anmerkung zu einer Recension der Jacobischen Schriften im XIV. Bande des Hermes*. Pp. 278-289. In vol. 19 of the *Viennese Jahrbücher der Literatur*, 1822. Signed only with initials and never before identified as Schlegel's work; first referred to by Körner in *Briefe von und an Friedrich und Dorothea Schlegel*, 1926, p. 558.

5. and 6. Two papers, each entitled *Von der Schönheit in der Dichtkunst*. 1795-1796. Pp. 363-387. In the municipal library at Treves.

These new products from the workshop of Friedrich Schlegel, accompanied by notes whose sparseness is to be explained solely by financial difficulties connected with publication, are prefaced by three valuable and important essays by Körner, "Friedrich Schlegels philosophische Lehrjahre" (pp. 3-114), "Friedrich Schlegel und Frau von Staël" (pp. 223-239), and "Friedrich Schlegels Entwurf einer Ästhetik" (pp. 333-362). The reviewer believes that these one hundred fifty pages present a more accurate account of Schlegel's importance and a more illuminating analysis of his mind than has ever been essayed before.

Körner makes it clear that metaphysics formed Schlegel's main occupation throughout his life. He was an empiricist, without a strict method, and really strove for a glorified popular philosophy, without ever venturing to formulate it fully. His main work, Körner proves, is not to be found in the much-discussed aphorisms or fragments of his youth, but in the neglected drafts and writings of his mature years. And his conversion represents no sudden rupture; it is part of a steady, unbroken line of development, a gradual ascent. It should be considered not the end but the begin-

ning—a key to the man, showing a scientific desire for a theoretical faith, a philosophical religion.

Schlegel's philosophy, Körner shows, is essentially a philosophy of history and stamps him as the first exponent of "Geistesgeschichte." His Spinoza-Hemsterhuisian philosophy formed a polar union with that of Kant and Fichte. He desired a synthesis of the two great currents of the eighteenth century, that of Kant < Fichte, based on Plato, and that of Lessing, Herder, Jacobi < Goethe, based on Spinoza. But he did not imitate any man; he strove to supplant them all. If Romanticism fuses the two great movements of the eighteenth century, the increasingly radical Rationalism with its individualism and the old, sometimes subterranean irrationalist-antiindividualistic wave, young Friedrich represents the former and the convert Friedrich the latter.

As for the Jena lectures which Körner publishes and which depend largely upon Fichte, Spinoza and Schelling, it is interesting to note that here Schlegel is already veering away from Fichte in content, though not in formal matters, that the notorious doctrine of irony has vanished, and that the idea of immortality, derived from Spinoza, is identical with Goethe's, who acquired it by way of Schelling, however. Ideologically the Jena lectures represent a halfway station on the road to the Paris-Cologne lectures of 1805-1806.

Körner throws new light on the relations of Hegel and Schlegel (p. 88 ff.) and has a psychological explanation for many of Schlegel's bad traits, such as his biting wit, arrogance and smartness (p. 95). Jacobi attracted and repelled Schlegel because he saw in him a reflection of his own vacillation between Christianity and Spinozism, faith and knowledge, philosophy and poetry. But Schlegel did not stop at Fichte and idealism, as Jacobi did. His philosophy and theosophy went beyond Fichte, for he was a heathen by dint of his reason, a Christian by virtue of his heart. Like Schelling, Schlegel strove for development from realism to spiritualism by way of idealism. In short, even in the bosom of the Mother Church Schlegel remained a Romantic, and in his theology a philosopher.

Schlegel never rounded out his philosophy; its "eigentliches Wesen," like that of his Romantic poetry, was "daß sie ewig nur werden, nie vollendet sein kann." To sum it up in a sentence: In 1788 the philosopher Schlegel began with a nebulous yearning, which by 1798 had become a system; transcending his power of logical expression, however, it was transplanted by him into the realm of poetry, until presently a super-conception, that of religion, developed, which embraced both philosophy and poetry. But he was first and always a dilettant. As for his importance today:

Manche seiner Lieblingsideen, die dem empiristischen 19. Jahrhundert abstrus erschienen, wie etwa die Lehre von einer werdenden Gottheit,

erfahren in unsern Tagen feierliche Urständ; Grundstellungen seines Denkens sind in Simmels Relativismus, in Bergsons Intuitionismus, in Max Schellers Religions- und Liebestheorie, in Jaspers und Heideggers Existenzphilosophie, in der neuen christlichen Philosophie des Russen Berdjajew neu bezogen worden. Heute, wo so viele nach einer positiven Philosophie suchen und den Idealismus hinter ein wieder lebendig gewordenes Christentum zurückdrängen, wird auch der christliche Denker Friedrich Schlegel willkommen sein (p. 114).

Körner's discussion of the relation of Friedrich and Mme de Staël adds to the knowledge supplied by Countess de Pange in *Mme de Staël et la découverte de l'Allemagne* (Paris, 1929). Friedrich met her about half a year after his brother Wilhelm did. He was her guest at Coppet for six weeks late in 1804 and again at Acosta Castle near Rouen from November, 1806, to April, 1807. On the latter occasion he delivered to her his lectures on German philosophy, which she desired in preparation for *De l'Allemagne* but later did not use. They became estranged in 1807 when she felt that his demands exceeded the value of his services, and were never again permanently reconciled, although they continued to think highly of one another.

The two papers on esthetics, which appear in last place but should, chronologically, be at the head of the volume, with the second paper preceding the first, form useful supplements to Schlegel's already known contributions on the subject. By a process of clever piecing together Körner succeeds in evolving and exposing Schlegel's esthetic "system" more adequately than ever before.

It is to be sincerely hoped that American scholars interested in German Romanticism will give this volume a warm welcome. For it will depend largely upon the reception of Körner's work whether he will be able to publish additional finds. And their publication is of transcending importance, for no further work on German Romanticism can profitably be done until these materials have been made accessible.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

*University of Cincinnati*

---

*Bibel und deutsche Kultur. Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Bibel-Archivs in Hamburg. Bd. II. III: Die Psalmenverdeutschung von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte mit tabellarischen Übersichten. Erste, Zweite Hälfte hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit FRITZ JÜLICHER und WILLY LÜDTKE von HANS VOLLMER. Mit einem Sonderabschnitt "Die jiddische Psalmenübersetzung" von SALOMO BIRNBAUM. IV: Verdeutschung der Paulinischen Briefe von den ersten*

*Anfängen bis Luther.* Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte mit neuen Texten, synoptischen Tabellen und 3 Bildtafeln hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit FRITZ JÜLICHER, WILLY LÜDTKE und RICHARD NEWALD von HANS VOLLMER. Potsdam, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1932, 1933, 1934. Each volume M. 20.

These publications of the Bibel-Archiv at Hamburg, edited by Hans Vollmer in co-operation with the other scholars cited above, are an important contribution to our knowledge of the German Bible before Luther. Volumes Two and Three, devoted to the Psalms, consist primarily of tables giving, side by side, readings from selected Psalms from as many as eighty texts, from the Old Saxon, Anglo-Saxon, and Old High German down to and including Luther, both in his earliest as well as in his later redactions. The selections from the Psalms proper are supplemented by some of the Canticles, as well as the Lord's Prayer, so that we have before us, in numerous versions, the following biblical passages: Psalm 6, 28, 29, 31, 37, 50, 101, 114, 129, 138, 142; I. Sam. 2, 1-10; Matth. 6, 9-13; Luke 1, 46-55; 68-79; Luke 2, 29-32; in addition, under the caption *Splitter*, there are brief excerpts, sometimes of only a few words, from a number of other Psalms. Several of the above Psalms (6, 31, 101) are among the so-called Penitential Psalms, and thus enable comparison with Luther's earliest translation, namely *Die Sieben Fußpsalm* of 1517.

Volume Four, devoted to the Pauline Epistles, is similar in structure to its predecessors, but here the parallel texts (Romans 13, 11-14; I. Cor. 5, 7-8; I. Cor. 13, 1-13; Philipians 2, 5-8; Hebrews 12, 28-13, 8) are followed by the full text of the Pauline Epistles as found in two recently discovered manuscripts, at Gotha and Salzburg. This part of the volume is edited by Richard Newald, the remainder is the work of Vollmer and his other associates.

The parallel texts are preceded by an exhaustive commentary, in which are considered not merely the readings of the biblical texts in the various ancient versions, but also the glossators and commentators whose interpretations might have influenced a given passage: Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Chrysostomus, Gregory, Nicolaus de Lyra, Petrus von Herenthals, and others. On occasion, biblical quotations in sermons and the like are also adduced. On the basis of all these readings, Vollmer attempts to discover the relationship of the various German translations, coming to the conclusion that these are much more dependent upon one another than had hitherto been assumed: he posits a "Traditions-Strom, dessen Spur wir überall verfolgen konnten" (III, 68), and is also sure "Daß auch Luther nicht unbeeinflusst blieb von älterer Tradition"



(ib.). This conclusion is arrived at by a cumulation of evidence such as the following:

In Psalm 37, 2 (II, 42) Vollmer considers *straelas pine*, the Anglo-Saxon translation of *sagittae tuae*, when compared with *dine strāla* of Notker, as an indication of relationship between the two versions: I fail to see how one can attach any weight to a frequently occurring West Germanic word such as this, when used in its normal meaning. On the same page, Vollmer considers the agreement of Zainer (ca. 1475) and Luther in translating *iniquitates* by *missetat* as remarkable. But the word *missetat*, as a reference to Graff, Lexer or Grimm will show, goes back to Ulfilas, and is found in many Old and Middle High German texts, Graff and Lexer citing more than two score examples, from the Old High German glosses down to the *Zimmerische Chronik*. How can any importance be attached to the use of such a word? Similarly, in Psalm 101, 7 (II, 74) the Anglo-Saxon Interlinear Version translates *nycticorax* by *naeththrefn*, while the Windberg Psalter here has *nachtrabe*: Vollmer considers this agreement as very striking (*ganz auffällig*). Here again Graff cites more than a dozen instances from Old High German, while Diefenbach<sup>1</sup> cites an even larger number from glossaries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; Grimm also (VII, 204) gives numerous references to texts of all periods: is it not more logical to assume that the Windberg scribe got the word from a German glossary, rather than from the Anglo-Saxon? Moreover, the composition of the word is so simple, and the translation so literal, that a translator of average intelligence would hardly need outside help.

Psalm 142, 6, in the Vulgate of to-day, reads: "Expandi manus meas ad te: anima mea, sicut terra sine aqua, tibi." Vollmer particularly stresses the fact that the words *anima mea* were left untranslated by Notker, as well as by Linköping, Hamburg 2060, and the two editions of the Cologne Bible:

Wie hat hier Notkers Text unter der Oberfläche nachgewirkt? Daß sich auch hier seine Spur verrät, ist doch wohl anzunehmen, solange nicht eine gemeinsame lateinische Vorlage nachgewiesen ist, in der das *anima mea* fehlte. Wir kennen eine solche Vorlage nicht.

This conclusion does not follow at all: in the first place, the words *anima mea* stand alone in the Vulgate, without a verb, so that two redactors, unable to construe them, might independently have omitted them; secondly, not all the medieval manuscripts of the Vulgate have come down to us, and thirdly, I doubt whether Vollmer has collated all that have come down. The late Eberhard Nestle, when editing Luther's Latin edition of the *Pentateuch* etc. (1529), noted a large number of unusual readings of this edition,

<sup>1</sup> *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum mediae et infimae aetatis*, Francofurti, 1857, p. 380.

but was unable to discover the particular edition of the Vulgate used by Luther as his source.

The fact that the reviewer is unable to follow Vollmer in all his deductions is not intended as an implication that his task, in general, has not been well done: on the contrary, he and his associates have produced an accurate and painstaking piece of work, remarkably free of misprints.

W. KURRELMAYER

*La Terre et les Morts dans l'Oeuvre de Chateaubriand.* By OLGA LONGI. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. 138. \$1.25.

In recent years many of the literary works in France deal with the theme of patriotism and nationalism, especially in their relation to the native province, the ancestral home, and the cult of the dead. This trend is particularly noticeable in the works of such writers as Maurice Barrès, Charles Maurras, Jules Lemaitre, Paul Bourget, and Henri Bordeaux. Miss Longi in her interesting work has made a careful study of this subject in the writings of Chateaubriand. In her Preface she states her purpose as follows: "Un essai de définition et d'analyse du sentiment de la patrie dans l'œuvre de Chateaubriand en fonction du culte du passé et de la terre ancestrale."

An excellent background for the proposed study is presented in the Introduction (pp. 13-46) where a valuable sketch is given of the development of the idea of patriotism in France, with its various aspects, from the Middle Ages up to the time of Chateaubriand. The main body of the work is devoted to tracing the conception or sentiment of "la patrie," both on the literary and political sides, in the writings of Chateaubriand from the *Voyage en Amérique* through the *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*. The first period studied is the one in which were written *le Voyage en Amérique*, *l'Essai sur les Révolutions*, and *les Natchez*. In his desire for individual liberty the author frees himself from social bonds and repudiates the "patrie." *Le Voyage* is a glorification of nature, *l'Essai* is the negation of christianity, civilization and sentiment; the *Natchez* is a further development of the same themes. *Le Génie du Christianisme* may be considered as representative of the second stage in the evolution of Chateaubriand's conception of patriotism. Here love of country is considered as a moral instinct of divine essence. It begins with affection for one's birthplace and "le respect des cendres des morts," then, with religion as its true source, it broadens out to include the entire country. The third period, represented by the author's remaining productions, merely furnishes a new treatment, an amplification of

the ideas of the *Génie*. At the end of her "Conclusion," Miss Longi presents an evaluation of the influence of Chateaubriand's conception on later writers with illustrative passages from their works. She wisely refrains, throughout the book, from claiming for her author too much influence in this direction. Her conclusion in this matter may be summed up in her own words, "Le premier, il (Chateaubriand) entreprend de renouveler, illustrer, vivifier une idée déjà existante."

Miss Longi has done an excellent piece of work on a subject particularly difficult because of its many ramifications.

D. H. CARNAHAN

*University of Illinois*

*L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope.* By E. AUDRA. Paris: Champion, 1931. Pp. 650.

In this large volume the evidence for Pope's indebtedness to French predecessors is presented in a loosely chronological-biographical arrangement. The account is readable, but a book of this size is more often consulted than read entire. One who goes through it all becomes aware of certain limitations that may not appear to the reader of a few pages. These limitations are chiefly due to the complexity of the material and to the method of attack.

There are, to be sure, numerous typographical errors, and there is no dearth of the small factual errors that are likely to creep into works of this sort. Pope's life and his personality are consistently misrepresented after the general fashion of Whitwell Elwin; but such details are perhaps irrelevant to the main purpose of the book. More important is the occasional misunderstanding of a poem or a passage in it. The first *Moral Essay* seems to Audra a reply to La Rochefoucauld; it is hard to believe others will share this view. The second *Moral Essay* he regards as violent and bitter against women, whereas in central purpose it is merely a compliment to Martha Blount at the expense of her variable sex. One is astonished to learn (p. 345) that Pope hated women cordially, and one can only greet with raised eyebrows Audra's opinion that "Ni Juvénal, ni Boileau surtout, n'ont rien écrit sur les femmes d'aussi dur." Audra revives the old notion that in the *Essay on Criticism* Pope wrote for critics but frequently addressed poets. Very few lines in the poem support such an idea. Audra follows Dennis in holding that the line "Still green with bays *each* ancient altar stands" indicates lack of discrimination on Pope's part: "Pope, lui, ne sait distinguer entre les grands et les médiocres. Il montre pour tous une égale admiration." He errs in thinking that the poem (ll. 584-7) attacks Dennis as a bad critic (p. 309): obviously

Dennis is here the bad poet who will brook no criticism of himself. On Ariel's withdrawal of protection from Belinda in the *Rape of the Lock* we get the astounding comment: "On ne pouvait sug-gérer plus discrètement, plus délicatement, à Miss Fermor ce qu'il était advenu (ou ce qu'il adviendrait bientôt) de sa chasteté!"

These faults, possibly irrelevant, serve nevertheless to undermine one's confidence in the less tangible matters of influence. Audra, to be sure, prefers to deal in tangible phrasal parallels, of which he sets forth an enormous array, of considerable average excellence. But the content of Pope's works is "what oft was thought," and the task of tracing commonplaces to exclusively French sources is difficult. Pope's reading, as Audra admits, was largely English and Classical, and one must cling to that fact. Audra tells us that for readers of Pope's day "il y avait assurément les Anciens, mais ils étaient bien loin. . . ." They seem almost out of sight in these pages. There is no doubt of the influence of French authors on Pope; one's scruples arise over specific cases only. More than once Audra uses the following thought-sequence: (1) a cautious or even a negative statement of influence; (2) a *pourtant*; and (3) a weaving about until the influence is, after all, strongly asserted (See pp. 525, 544, 549, 568). On page 525 we are told that in his conception of self-love Pope follows Shaftesbury, who answers Hobbes rather than La Rochefoucauld. A *pourtant* intervenes, and on page 527 we conclude that "Bien que dans tous ces développements il n'ait pas été question de La Rochefoucauld, c'est bien à lui que Pope, comme Shaftesbury, répondait par tout un système de philosophie optimiste."

In stressing exclusively francophile tendencies one is bound, though unintentionally, to falsify the picture. Consequently one ought to be very cautious in presenting large qualities such as love of order and clearness, as national traits to be attained by the English only through study of French models. When Audra looked into Bysshe's *Art of Poetry*, he found the section on prosody "trop clair et trop systématique pour être purement anglais" (p. 590 n.). He felt that there must be a French original; and with Gildon's help he has discovered Bysshe to be a close translation of part of Lancelot's *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre la Langue Latine* (1656). In spite of this brilliant practical exploitation of a "hunch," the idea that order and clearness (unless borrowed) are impossible to Bysshe's race will hardly have a wide appeal.

Audra provides many an illuminating parallel that shows Pope's ability in domesticating the phrases of others. He has made brilliant discoveries such as, above all, the original of the letter from Pope to Louis Racine which puts it beyond all doubt that Pope did not wish the *Essay on Man* to be regarded as anti-Catholic. In spite of such enviable achievements the detailed reasoning and general method frequently seem unimpressive.

Preoccupation with a single group of sources entails a bias in favor of the group. If Audra had assembled all the parallels—English, French, and Classical—for a single poem, such as the *Essay on Criticism*, no unavoidable bias need have existed. As it is, such a limitation injures a volume that contains, nevertheless, a mass of specific and valuable information.

GEORGE SHERBURN

*University of Chicago*

---

*Goldsmith and His Booksellers.* By ELIZABETH EATON KENT.  
(Cornell Studies in English, Vol. xx.) Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1933. Pp. 119.

The story of Goldsmith's literary career is very largely the story of his relations with what had come by the middle of the eighteenth century to be called "The Trade." Had Miss Kent concentrated her efforts on telling this story in its full detail afresh from the sources, she would undoubtedly have written a book for which all students of Goldsmith himself and of the literary history of his time would have been grateful. What she has actually attempted, however, is something very different: it is to sketch the history of Goldsmith's dealings with his principal publishers—Griffiths, the Dodsleys, Newbery, Davies, Griffin—in the context of an account, also somewhat rapid and sketchy, of the lives and characters of each of these men. The result is a book quite lacking in focus, in which most of the statements about the booksellers are irrelevant to an understanding of Goldsmith, and many of the statements about Goldsmith contribute little or nothing to the characterization of the booksellers.

This would not matter so much, perhaps, had Miss Kent made amends for her want of a unifying theme by adding significantly to our knowledge of the various persons and episodes with which she deals. Except on one relatively minor point, however—the source of Griffiths' LL. D. degree (pp. 13-15)—she has little to say, either about Goldsmith or his booksellers, that is not easily accessible in the standard biographies and works of reference. Her knowledge of the available secondary literature, moreover, is by no means complete—witness her neglect of the valuable papers on Goldsmith by R. W. Seitz; and her use of the authorities she does know is too often negligent and uncritical. As a consequence she perpetuates a good many of the errors of her predecessors and occasionally adds new ones of her own. Mr. Seitz has called attention elsewhere to the inadequacy of her account of Goldsmith's relations with Griffiths in 1758 and 1759 (*MP.*, xxxi, 316-17), and a fairly long list could be made of similar confusions and mis-

statements in her treatment of other points. I content myself with mentioning some of the more obvious slips:

Pp. 20, 31, 115: it is an error to say that Percy published "a short life of Goldsmith" in 1774 "under his own name"; no such book, signed or unsigned, is known; the *Life* which Miss Kent evidently has in mind is an anonymous pamphlet based largely upon Glover's article in the *Universal Magazine* for May, 1774.—P. 22: one would like to know the evidence for the statement that Dr. Milner, the common friend of Goldsmith and Griffiths, "at times contributed to *The Monthly Review*"; there seems to be no mention of him in Griffiths' marked copy in the Bodleian (see B. C. Nangle, *The Monthly Review, First Series, 1749-1789*, Oxford, 1934).—P. 47: the statements about the fate of the "Chronological History of the Lives of Eminent Persons of Great Britain and Ireland" need to be revised in the light of R. W. Seitz' paper in *MP.* for February, 1931 (xxviii, 329 ff.).—Pp. 51, 61: there is no evidence that Goldsmith was allied with Newbery as early as 1758; the essays in the *Literary Magazine* for that year which were ascribed to him by Prior and Gibbs are now known to be almost certainly not his (see Seitz in *RES.*, v (1929), 410 ff.).—P. 62: the suggestion that the friendship between Goldsmith and Johnson had its origin in Goldsmith's essay on "The Fame Machine" in the *Bee* for November 3, 1759, is pure conjecture; the earliest clear record of any personal relations between the two men dates from May, 1761.—P. 64: *The Art of Poetry on a New Plan* and *A Poetical Dictionary* are two distinct works and not two (or, as Miss Kent seems to imply, three) forms of the same work; with the latter, so far as is known, Goldsmith had nothing to do (the compiler was Samuel Derrick), and his share in the former cannot be determined with any precision.—P. 64 n.: the statement which Miss Kent quotes from my *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith* requires modification in view of Seitz' article on *The Lives of the Fathers* (*MP.*, xxvi (1929), 295 ff.).—P. 65: the statement that Newbery paid Goldsmith £20 for revising *The History of Mecklenburgh* rests on nothing more substantial than an admitted guess by Prior (repeated by Forster), made in the course of an estimate of Goldsmith's income in 1762: "The history of Mecklenburgh if he were actually the author, may be estimated by the value of other works at twenty pounds" (*Life*, I, 416).—P. 68: it was in October, 1762, not 1763, that Goldsmith sold a third share of the *Vicar* to Collins of Salisbury.—P. 70: his *Survey of Experimental Philosophy* was published, not "toward the end of 1765," but posthumously in 1776.—P. 70: the guess of Prior and Forster that Goldsmith contributed in 1765 to the *Museum rusticum et commerciale* is not confirmed by an examination of the contents of that periodical.

Miss Kent, it is only fair to say, writes agreeably and sympathetically of her subject as she conceives it, and is clearly capable of better work than she has done in this first book. It is a pity that she was encouraged to publish her findings so prematurely.

University of Chicago

R. S. CRANE

*The Roman de longue Haleine on English Soil.* By THOMAS PHILIP HAVILAND. Philadelphia: 1931. Pp. 184. (University of Penn. diss.)

By the "Roman de longue Haleine" the author means the heroic romance of the seventeenth century. This formidable type of romance is not so well known as it should be even to those specializing in seventeenth century literature, and a study such as this by Dr. Haviland, which gives a clear picture of the nature of the type and its essential characteristics, is particularly welcome. The author knows whereof he speaks; while he modestly describes his monograph as "a study of the manner, form, and content of the French Heroic Romance in translation," he gives unmistakable evidence of an acquaintance with the French originals, as well as with the English translations.

Briefly summarized the features of the heroic romance, as he presents them, are as follows: Love and war dominate; love is a mighty passion, burning, devastating, overpowering; it is worshiped to the point of idolatry and governed by a very definite code. War on a grand scale is always in progress or imminent; the fate of cities, kingdoms, and empires hangs in balance, and shifts with the fortunes of the hero; pending the outcome, the reader must learn the life histories of the main and minor characters, their exploits, and adventures; everything marches in the easily recognizable heroic style, a style best exhibited in the romances of La Calprenède and Scudéry.

The English romances are described less fully but with sufficient detail to give a fair picture of their nature. These, the author shows, "fall lamentably short of the French originals" in tone and spirit; they never achieve the full length of their French models. Roger Boyle's *Parthenissa*, the best of the imitations, ran only 808 pages folio, less than one third the length of *The Grand Cyrus*, "and then was given up by the noble author in despair." As the best example of its kind it deserves the full treatment accorded it. Other heroic romances treated less in detail are: Barclay's *Argenis* (written in Latin), Richard Brathwait's *Panthalia*, Nathaniel Ingelo's *Bentivolio and Urania*, and Sir George Mackenzie's *Aretina*. After a brief discussion of the influence of the type on Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*, Mary Manley's *New Atalantis*, Jane Barker's *Exilius*, and Eliza Haywood's *Idalia*, Dr. Haviland proceeds with a discussion of Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Horace Walpole, and Scott.

The romances, he shows, were read in England well into the second quarter of the eighteenth century. By 1760, however, they had been forgotten. There is no direct proof, it appears, of Richardson's acquaintance with the type, although his treatment of love, a certain episodic quality of the stories, and the multiplicity

of characters may exhibit some influence. The elements that Fielding's novels had in common with the heroic romance, such as digression, character sketches, and perfect chivalry, go back, it appears, to earlier sources rather than to the intermediate type. Smollett, he thinks, was acquainted with the romances, but no specific evidence is cited.

In the novels of Sir Walter Scott, Dr. Haviland finds indisputable evidence of the author's acquaintance with the French romances. The scene in *Ivanhoe* where, the castle on fire, the Templar goes to Rebecca's apartment, is, as Scott himself admitted, imitated from the scene in Scudéry's *Grand Cyrus* where Philidaspes proposes to carry Mandane from burning Babylon. In *Peveril of the Peak*, Geoffrey Hudson is represented as reading one of Scudéry's romances. *The Talisman* and *Guy Mannering* resemble the French type in minor points of style and technique. With Scott the influence ends, in fact had ended sometime before, and Scott's interest must, accordingly, be interpreted as antiquarian. This is probably true, and we must conclude that the heroic romance did not affect appreciably the main currents of the eighteenth-century novel.

To the *Astrea*, discussed in the chapter dealing with the salon, wrong dates are assigned (p. 115). The dates should be as given by Hugues Vaganay in his edition of *L'Astrée* (1925-28, v, 551-61): i, 1607; ii, 1610; iii, 1619 (incompletely in 1618); iv, 1627 (incompletely in 1624); v, 1627 (by Baro, d'Urfé's secretary, after d'Urfé's death).

The conjecture that the 1652 translation of *Cassandra*, Books 1-3, was by the Lord George Digby is probably correct. In confirmation of this, I may add that on the title page of the copy in the Huntington Library, in the handwriting of John Egerton, 2nd Earl of Bridgewater, 1622-86, the translation is so assigned.

H. W. HILL

*The University of Southern California*

*The Defence of Poetry, Variations on the Theme of Shelley.* By BENEDETTO CROCE. The Philip Maurice Deneke Lecture Delivered at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, on the 17th of October 1933. Translated by E. F. Carritt. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. 31. \$0.40.

*The Appreciation of Poetry.* By ERNEST G. MOLL. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1933. Pp. xvii + 266. \$1.50.

Professor Croce in his "Defence of Poetry" and Mr. Moll in his appreciation of it have used much the same formula. An imposing



set of critical fictions which are said to be incapable of definition in logical terms are put on one side of an equation, poetry on the other and the two are said to be identical. Insofar as Professor Croce is discussing the word "poetry" rather than the experience of a poem his account is not without its pleasant moments, particularly when, after expressing some irritation with the "so-called critics" who defend pure poetry (is he here referring to M. Valéry?), he announces that "pure poetry in the pure sense of the term" has "an embodied soul." The "soul of truth in poetry" is distinguished from "the soul of truth in prose" by—no Crocean will be surprised—the "word, 'intuition'." Intuition cannot be translated into logical terms (a word), is something infinite (a thing), "has no other equivalent than the melody in which it is expressed" (a sound) and may be sung (a gesture). As Professor Croce has said these things many times before and in greater detail, his present account is pleasantly deft.

Mr. Moll's situation is more serious, for Mr. Moll taught the appreciation of poetry under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation. In order to read "creatively," he explains, "we must free the imagination . . . rise above habits of the commonplace . . . above all . . . hold steadily in mind that consciousness, awareness, for its own sake is the end of poetry"—the humor is not intended. To the vexed question of the relations between "thought" and "poetry," Mr. Moll replies that behind the "poetic reverie lie the riches of deep and concentrated thought"—a proposition which is either false or ambiguous—and asserts that the poet turns "abstractions into pictures." Our task ". . . refraining always from clumsy attempts at abstracting his ideas, is to receive those images warm and vivid through our imagination. . . ." The chapters on figures of speech and worlds of belief show that Mr. Moll is aware of the dangers which must be met when we attempt to give an account of the meanings of words by means of words. Unfortunately his linguistic instruments have not been tested with adequate care. To identify the experience referred to by the word "belief" with a "sense of reality" is not to solve the problems presented by Dante or Luther or Milton. The weakness of the book is less in the hypothesis that the appreciation of poetry can be taught, than in the attempt to induce the experience of poetry by means of these metaphors. Mr. Moll assumes, without, it would seem, adequate investigation, that the reader has "a knowledge of words sufficient to enable him to understand what is being said in a poem" (17). If a reader has this understanding, courses in the appreciation of poetry are unnecessary. If he does not have this understanding he is in need of more solid food than the airy fictions with which Mr. Moll operates. *The Appreciation of Poetry* is marred by several errors of transcription.

R. D. JAMESON

National Tsing Hua University, Peiping, China

*Charles Kingsley*. By STANLEY E. BALDWIN. Ithaca, New York: 1934. Pp. 207. (Cornell Studies in English, XXV.)

The purpose of Professor Baldwin's *Charles Kingsley* is, he says, "to present an account of the social, economic, and religious problems that Kingsley faced, and an appreciation of his work in meeting those problems especially as an author." His failure to fulfil this admirable program is due chiefly to the defects of a virtue peculiarly dear to Charles Kingsley—chivalry. Like her husband, Mr. Baldwin takes Mrs. Charles Kingsley far too seriously. It has not occurred to him that there might be any other basis for the evaluation of Kingsley's life than the letters which his widow, in Mr. Baldwin's phrase, "gave to the world" in 1879; he is not aware, apparently, how much the widow refrained from giving. Unsuspicious of the large mass of uncatalogued Kingsley material in the British Museum and the still more illuminating documents in private hands, Mr. Baldwin has not realized that Mrs. Kingsley colored and touched up her portrait to suit her ideas of clerical propriety, that she alters phrases, omits important expressions of opinion, suppresses much that is racy and significant. So deferential is Mr. Baldwin to her that he makes little effort to go beyond her statements, to study Charles Kingsley in his works, to consider facts and documents other than those noticed by Mrs. Kingsley. And, not being on his guard, he accepts also her critical opinions and those she saw fit to quote, with the result that his judgments are frequently of the nineteenth rather than the twentieth century.

In this brief space it is impossible to do more than suggest some of the more important points on which Mr. Baldwin's chivalry leads him amiss. He is puzzled, for instance, in *Yeast* to account for the insistence upon the holiness of the wedded state as compared with celibacy, an idea which begins there and runs through all the novels. He is unaware that the issue became a momentous personal one to Charles Kingsley when he was obliged to summon all his powers to persuade his beloved from entering a sisterhood. This is strikingly evident in the paragraphs which the "beloved" (as his widow) did not quote from the introduction to the manuscript prose *Life of St. Elizabeth*. And that this attitude of hers was no individual idiosyncrasy one may read in any number of letters and novels of the day.

In his consideration of the condition-of-the-poor chapters in *Yeast* and *Alton Locke* and his summary of Kingsley's debt to Carlyle and Maurice, Mr. Baldwin is working independently of Mrs. Kingsley and with the essential documents. Here, in consequence, he thinks clearly and adequately and this is certainly the most useful part of the book though it contains nothing which is new.

With *Hypatia* Mr. Baldwin finds himself in difficulty again because he has unfortunately tried to make a distinction between the historical and the propaganda novels. When one regards *Hypatia* merely as a picture of fifth century Christianity it is not easy to find its purpose. It must be read in the light of *Phaeton*, published in the same year, as an attack upon that Emersonianism which Kingsley considered the most dangerous heresy of his day. One of the unpublished letters to John Parker makes this clear:

I have carefully avoided pointing any moral whatsoever much as I have been tempted to make people see what I suppose the wise see without my telling them, that it is an attack on the Emersonian pseudo-spiritualism of the present day, not on metaphysical grounds, but showing *in action* that it has less hold on the human sympathies than even the lowest forms of orthodox Christianity.

That *Westward Ho!* was not merely an historical novel but a recruiting pamphlet for the Crimean War Mr. Baldwin admits, though here, as with *Hypatia*, he is inclined to overemphasize its value as a picture of its period. Like Mrs. Kingsley he accepts the fact that Kingsley labored over historical details as evidence of historical grasp.

*Two Years Ago* was, as Kingsley wrote to Maurice, "another sidestroke at the Tartarus doctrine." This Mr. Baldwin sees but he barely touches on another important problem with which it deals, the nineteenth century attitude toward the artist. Kingsley's point of view here cannot be thoroughly understood without reference to the early manuscript draft of *Yeast*—an extraordinarily interesting documents—and the complete version of the August 6, 1855 letter to Maurice:

Only do not fear that ultimately I shall be content with being "an artist." I despise and loathe the notion from the bottom of my heart. I have felt its temptation: but I *will* by God's help, fight against that.

When he considers Kingsley as an artist Mr. Baldwin shares the opinions of the poet-novelist's most enthusiastic contemporaries: he admires the "word pictures" beloved by Mudie's subscribers, he approves "Be good, sweet maid, and let who will be clever," and he summarizes Kingsley's life as "a poem of deep lyric passion."

MARGARET FARRAND THORP

Princeton, New Jersey

---

*Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F.R.S. A Correspondence.* By GORDON HUNTINGTON HARPER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. 221. \$2.00.

The author's untimely death on 28 April 1934 casts a shadow of sorrow upon what would otherwise be a delightful task. The delight arises from the fact that here at last is proof that a thesis for the Ph. D. degree may be a genuinely interesting and humane document; the sorrow, that so promising a scholar should be taken from us before he had yet fairly begun his career. Gordon Huntington Harper we shall see no more in the flesh, but we shall through this volume be kept alive to the discrimination and sensitiveness of his spirit.

Gordon Harper's was a rare opportunity. Such a correspondence as that between a future Catholic cardinal and a distinguished scientist and his wife — all three intimate friends — cannot perforce occur often. Newman's mind was incorrigibly theological. The nuances of subtle distinctions in theology were as natural to him as the air he breathed. However much we may be inclined to differ from him in belief, however deluded we may feel him to have been, we find it difficult not to believe that he was thoroughly sincere. He was, in his own way, a saint, and he had the saint's desire to bring all within what he thought was the true fold. William Froude, on the other hand, was agnostic and skeptical. One of the leading scientists of his time, and a member of a family almost perversely individualistic, he demanded that all subjects be brought within the pale of reason. With Matthew Arnold he believed that thinkers should "keep pushing on their posts into the darkness, and establish no post that is not perfectly in light, and firm." One can readily see that when such a religious enthusiast attempts to win such a thorough-going scientist to Roman Catholicism there will be a battle royal. That battle is the substance of this correspondence, and therein lies its value. It actually throws light upon the religious ferment of the times. Although Mrs. Froude went over to Rome, William remained steadfast in his own position. That all three maintained their friendship speaks well for their quality of character.

For this correspondence Mr. Harper has written thirty pages of introduction wherein in clear and vigorous English he tells more than is often accomplished in many a dull thesis of 300 or more pages which consist mostly of quotation. These thirty pages give the results, not the processes of research. For this reason I hail the volume as a token of a better day in literary studies. All concerned in its production merit praise: the English Faculty of the School of Higher Studies of The Johns Hopkins University for fostering the work, the Johns Hopkins Press for making a really

attractive volume from every mechanical point of view, the lamented author for working upon significant material with such admirable discrimination. Here is one thesis — if it may be called such — that shall sit on my shelves along with other volumes of vital literary and historical quality.

WALDO H. DUNN

*College of Wooster*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*John Henry: a Folk-lore Study.* By LOUIS W. CHAPPELL. Jena, 1933. After so much has been written concerning the American ballad of John Henry, the time is undoubtedly ripe for a thorough study of the history of the tradition on which it is based and an account of the varying forms the ballad has assumed. This task Mr. Chappell has carried out with great industry and ability. A ballad of "John Henry" can hardly be said to exist, since there are really many songs with diverse texts based vaguely on the adventures of one man. Indeed a problem which engages Mr. Chappell's attention, as it has that of his predecessors, is whether these songs concern one or two men. The author shows convincingly that songs about John Henry, the steel-driving man who competed with the steam drill, and about an outlaw, John Hardy, are separate traditions, though sometimes they have become confused with each other. Much of the labor in preparing the study concerned itself with tracking down traditions about John Henry. This is done with much skill. Two facts stand out: the vitality of traditions about the hero, and the great variety of these traditions, often quite inconsistent with one another. About so central a point as to his color there is no agreement. It is unfortunate that the author should feel himself aggrieved at the work of others who have treated the legend and particularly that he should take up so important a part of his study with an arguing of his proprietary rights. With this single exception the book represents a notable advance in ballad scholarship. When many other traditions have been so thoroughly studied, we may be ready to draw some safe conclusions as to the nature of American traditional songs.

STITH THOMPSON

*Indiana University*

---

*Thomas Percy, Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte seiner Werke.* Von HEINZ MARWELL. Göttingen: "Göttinger Tageblatt," 1934. Pp. 130. Since, so far as he knows, no scientific estimate of the work and personality of Thomas Percy has appeared, Heinz Marwell undertakes, by an analysis and interpretation of Percy's correspondence and his diaries (1753-1811), to present evidence relating to the historical genesis of the Bishop's published and unpublished works. From such sources he cites passages that concern the development of Percy's literary endeavors. The investigation is divided into two major parts, Percy's publications and his projected publications.

This study of "the genetic process of Percy's works" is to be regarded, according to the author, only as "building-stone" to be added to similar materials garnered by other investigators out of which later "a more truly creative and scientifically grounded estimate" of Percy can be produced. As no definite thesis is stated, no conclusions are reached. But Marwell's method of handling his material and his careful documentation show a mastery of the mechanics of scholarship. Students of Percy and of Thomas Warton will be interested in what Marwell says (p. 11) concerning the Warton Papers acquired by the British Museum in 1931, which contain twenty letters in Percy's own handwriting to Warton (not accessible to Clarissa Rinaker or to Leah Dennis). There is a bibliography but no index.

HERBERT DRENNON

*Murray State Teachers College*

*The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning.* Edited by WILLIAM CLYDE DEVANE. New York: Crofts & Co., 1934. Pp. xxiii + 387. Mr. DeVane's anthology embraces all of the best of Browning's shorter poems—if the length of *The Flight of the Duchess*, which is omitted, excludes it from that category—and is to be commended for its balance and inclusiveness. The volume thus avoids the danger of an *ex-parte* or merely popular choice of selections and amply illustrates the range and variety of the poet's work in the lyric and dramatic monologue. The chronological arrangement aids the reader in following the gradual development of Browning as a poet. In his Introduction, Mr. DeVane subordinates formal biography to a sketch of the growth of Browning's poetic mind and an estimation of the salient characteristics of his genius. The notes on individual poems combine accuracy of information with clearness and objectivity of presentation.

WILLIAM O. RAYMOND

*Bishop's University*

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

DECEMBER, 1935

Number 8

---

## THE DATE OF FLETCHER'S *THE NIGHT-WALKER*

The comedy entitled *The Night-walker, or The Little Thief* was, when first printed in 1640, ascribed by its publishers solely to John Fletcher. In the form in which it is preserved, however, it has undergone additions and perhaps "corrections," presumably made in 1633. In that year appeared Prynne's *Histrionomastix*, which is alluded to by name in III, iv; in May of that year, Sir Henry Herbert licensed it as "a play of Fletchers, corrected by Shirley, called *The Night Walkers*";<sup>1</sup> and in the following January it was "Lik't as a merry Play"<sup>2</sup> when presented at court before the King and Queen.

Fletcher's earlier editors, because of Herbert's statement, assumed that the play "having been left imperfect by Fletcher, was corrected and finished by Shirley."<sup>3</sup> Modern critics have, however, preferred the view that the play had been completed by Fletcher many years before and was merely revised by Shirley in 1633. For the date of Fletcher's original comedy, no evidence has been brought forward. Macaulay observed that it "was, perhaps, as early as 1614."<sup>4</sup> Thorndike, after noting that "A number of allusions to books (III, 3) have not been identified," queries, "may not 'a new Book of Fools' be Armin's Nest of Ninnies, 1608?"<sup>5</sup> Oliphant remarks that "the verse of the Fletcher portion seems to me early in style,"<sup>6</sup> and that both in this play and in *The Woman's Prize*

<sup>1</sup> J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> A. Dyce, *Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, XI, 121.

<sup>4</sup> *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, 158.

<sup>5</sup> *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, p. 90.

<sup>6</sup> *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, p. 490. Oliphant also records the dating of the play by certain of his correspondents, whose views, I believe, are not printed elsewhere. Mr. W. J. Lawrence, because of the

there is an allusion to *A Woman Killed with Kindness* — an allusion, however, which I suspect most conservative scholars will be unable to recognize. Presumably he prefers a date of 1609, for he closes his discussion of the play with the sentence: "Thorndike suggests that 'the new book of fools' referred to in the play may be Armin's 'Nest of Ninnies,' issued in 1608; and, for my own part, I am inclined to accept that suggestion, and date Fletcher's work accordingly."<sup>7</sup>

Aside from Oliphant's conviction that the Fletcherian portions of the play are in his early style, the only argument for so early a date hitherto advanced, is the identification of "a new book of fools" with *The Nest of Ninnies* — an identification which at best is most hazardous in view of the continued popularity of fool literature. It is, moreover, to be doubted whether in the books and ballads mentioned in III, iii and iv, it was the author's intention that in each instance an allusion be recognized. In the former scene Lurcher and his sister Alathe, to gain entrance into the house of Justice Algripe, appear in the street below disguised as peddlers of books and ballads at a time when the Justice, from a window above, is directing the defence of his house against the siege by the mother and Nurse of his discarded bride. By hawking titles which please the Justice because they discomfort the women, the brother and sister gain admittance and, as is shown in the following scene, proceed to chastize the Justice after having deafened the servants to the cries of their master by giving each of them certain books or ballads to read. In this latter scene Prynne's *Histriomastix* (1633) and Taylor's *Hempseed* (1620) are mentioned by title, but the latter of these may well have been, like the former, added by Shirley. A few of the titles which the pretended peddlers hawk suggest definite allusions — such as the ballad of the witches hanged at Ludlow, a hanging which might present very helpful evidence for the date of the play, but of which I have been unable to discover any record. The greater number of the titles, however, seem most certainly not to refer to particular books of the day but to have been coined by Lurcher and Alathe with the view to discomforting

£2 fee collected by Herbert, thought "Shirley must have worked on an unfinished play of Fletcher's," and Mr. Wells was "inclined to date the earlier version to the same year with *The Winter's Tale*" (pp. 490 and 492). Mr. Wells's reasons for this date are not given.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 492.



both Algripe and the women.<sup>8</sup> If, however, a particular volume is referred to in "a new book of fools," the allusion, rather than to the *Nest of Ninnies*, 1608, is much more likely to be to *More fooles yett*, entered upon the Stationers' Register June 1, 1610.<sup>9</sup> Not only is the title of the latter volume more nearly that given in the play, but other evidence indicates that Fletcher's work upon the play was completed after the beginning of 1611.

Near the opening of III, iii, as Lady impatiently awaits the women who are to join her in railing against Justice Algripe, Toby observes:

<sup>8</sup> Observe, for instance, the following dialogue in which the titles, suggested wholly by the situation, seem coined for the moment:

*Alathe.* Buy a ballad,

A ballad of the maid was got with child!

*Toby.* That might ha' been my case last night: I'll ha't, Whate'er it cost me.

[In II, ii, Toby had been mistaken in the dark by Wildbrain for Mistress Newlove.]

*Lurc.* A book of walking spirits!

*Alg.* That I like not.

[In II, iv, Lurcher and Alathe had confronted Algripe, as he made his way home through the night, with the body of his supposedly dead bride.]

*Lurc.* A book of wicked women!

*Alg.* That's well thought on.

*Lurc.* Of rude, malicious women, of proud women,  
Of scolding women!—We shall ne'er get in.

*Alathe.* A ballad of wrong'd maids!

*Lady.* I'll buy that.

*Lurc.* A little book, very little book,  
Of good and godly women, a very little one,  
So little you may put it in a nutshell!

*Nurse.* Peace, sirrah! or I'll tear your books.

*Alg.* Open the door and let him in; I love him.

*Lurc.* A book of evil magistrates!

[After quoting Weber's observation that this "Probably alludes to the *Mirror for Magistrates*, or some of its numerous imitations" [!] Dyce merely adds "Doubtful, I think."]

*Lady.* Ay, marry,  
D'ye hear that, Justice?

*Lurc.* And their eviller wives,  
That wear their places in their petticoats!

*Alg.* D'ye hear that, lady?

<sup>9</sup> Arber, *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, III, 196.

They'll come,  
 Fear not, Madam, and bring clappers with 'em,  
 Or some have lost their old wont: I have heard  
 (No disparagement to your ladyship) some o'their tongues,  
 Like Tom-a-Lincoln, three miles off.

As I have already had occasion to note in my attempt to date *The Woman's Prize*,<sup>10</sup> the great bell of Lincoln Cathedral, founded in the minster yard in December, 1610, and christened Tom o' Lincoln,<sup>11</sup> was shortly after hung in the north-west tower, whence on January 27, 1610-11, it "range owt and all safe and well."<sup>12</sup> It may be asserted with confidence that the allusion in *The Night-walker* to the bell's great sound, which would obviously have been most apt early in 1611, was introduced by Fletcher in his original play. Not only would the allusion be much less apt in 1633, when Shirley made his additions — and there is nothing to indicate that the play was twice revised — but the fact that in *The Woman's Prize*<sup>13</sup> Fletcher similarly likened the voice of a scolding woman to the great sound of Tom o' Lincoln makes it reasonably certain that the simile was his. Further, that he used the allusion in the *Woman's Prize* at a time when it was both new and apt, argues perhaps that it was apt when used in *The Night-walker*.

The date about 1611, suggested by the allusion to Tom o' Lincoln, is further urged by the close similarity which *The Night-walker* bears to *The Woman's Prize* and by the indebtedness which both of these plays apparently owe to Jonson's *Epicoene* (1609). Jonson's character of Morose seems to have left a deep impression upon Fletcher, as is not surprising in view of the esteem in which Ben was held by the younger dramatist. Attention has been called to the kinship of Moroso of *The Woman's Prize* (with his night-

<sup>10</sup> In an article to appear in *Modern Philology*.

<sup>11</sup> *Statues of Lincoln Cathedral*, arranged by Henry Bradshaw, 1897; Part II, p. 604 n. Rawnsley, *Highways and Byways in Lincolnshire*, p. 99.

<sup>12</sup> Raven, *Bells of England*, pp. 249-50, quoting from North, *Church Bells of Lincolnshire*, an extract from the muniments of the Dean and Chapter headed "Conc'neing y<sup>e</sup> greate Bell" and dated January 30, 1610-11.

<sup>13</sup> In III, ii, Petruchio wonders why he should ever have taken a second wife. Had he not, he asks himself, been tortured enough during the life of his first wife:

Had I not every morning a rare breakfast,  
 Mix'd with a learned lecture of ill-language,  
 Louder than Tom o' Lincoln?

cap which "looks like half a winding sheet") to Morose ("with the huge turban of nightcaps on his head buckled over his ears").<sup>14</sup> Save in his name, Justice Algripe of *The Night-walker* presents an equally close borrowing. He is a miserly pantaloone who has arranged to be married solely for mercenary gain; in one scene, at least (III, iii), the comedy is furnished by his being tormented with noise, and twice there are references to his nightcaps. In III, i, Wildbrain, explaining why he had counselled Algripe's young wife "to make the reverend coxcomb her husband, cuckold," asks his aunt if she would be content to have Algripe's

Anointed hams, to keep his hinges turning,  
Reek ever in your nose, and twenty night-caps  
With twenty several sweats?

And in v, ii, the Nurse reports that in their hunt for the Justice they have searched all the prisons, and

did look among the quarters too,  
And muster'd all the bridge-house for his night-cap.

That *The Night-walker* and *The Woman's Prize* were originally written about the same time is indicated not only by their both having apparently duplicated the use of the nightcaps of Morose, by both having an allusion to Great Tom of Lincoln, and by both including a reference to the proverb of a woman killed with kindness — not, I believe, as Mr. Oliphant insists, to Heywood's play. There are many other resemblances. The scene of both plays is London, and both contain many references to London places. III, iii, of *The Night-walker* presents almost exactly the reverse of the situation in *The Woman's Prize*. In the latter play the women lock themselves in an upstairs chamber behind fortifications likened unto those of Ostend,<sup>15</sup> with the men shouting and threatening below. In *The Night-walker* it is the women who shout and threat from below, and Justice Algripe who, having locked his doors, shouts from above:

Some new fortifications! look to my doors;  
Put double bars! . . .

As in *The Woman's Prize* the besieged women are succored and seconded by a horde of City Women and Country Women, deter-

<sup>14</sup> Gayley, *Representative English Comedies*, III, lxvi.

<sup>15</sup> *The Woman's Prize*, I, iii.

mined that woman's governance shall be maintained; so in *The Night-walker* the Lady, besieging the embattled Algripe, is joined by an unnamed number of women who make her cause theirs—an unnamed number, but enough to make the enraged justice cry out,

More of the kennel? — Put more bolts to the doors there,  
And arm yourselves! Hell is broke loose upon us.

The similarity of the two situations leaves little doubt that one was prepared because of the success of the other; and that little doubt is banished by the appearance in this same scene (III, iii) of the topical allusion common to the two plays—the comparison of women's voices to the great sound of Tom of Lincoln.

Of the two similar situations that of *The Woman's Prize* is infinitely the more effective, because it, as that of *The Night-walker* does not, develops directly from the plot. The scene in the latter play has no close connection with the remainder of that play and appears clearly to be an interlude introduced either because of the success of a similar situation in an earlier play or because a hasty and perhaps hurried writer, such as Fletcher many times reveals himself to have been, was quite content to use again situations previously successful.

If, to be sure, this scene in *The Night-walker* was, as I think there can be little doubt, suggested by the situation in the earlier play, the allusion to the great bell of Lincoln, as it might also have come from the earlier play, retains its value only in setting a date prior to which the scene could not have been written. As, however, the style of *The Night-walker* resembles rather Fletcher's earlier style, as all of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays with London scenes are assigned to their early years; and as the composition and the technique seem most suggestive of *The Woman's Prize*, I think it safe to assign *The Night-walker* to the year 1611—most probably to a place immediately after *The Woman's Prize*.

Although perhaps no evidence toward a date for its composition can be found in the satire which in *The Night-walker* is directed upon a society of bell-ringers who call themselves "the worshipful company of the knights o' the west,"<sup>18</sup> such satire would have been quite timely in the year 1611. In IV, iii, after persuading the ringers, among whom are Wildbrain and Toby, to show their skill

<sup>18</sup> IV, iii and iv. Oliphant and Boyle agreed in viewing both these scenes as unaltered work of Fletcher.

by ringing in the dark, Lurcher and Alathe abscond with the clothes which the ringers have abandoned because of the strenuous exercise. The "Knights of the West" are clearly a group of amateur bell-ringers, eager for exercise and proud of their skill. Ellacombe<sup>17</sup> says that "probably the most ancient society of which we have any certain knowledge" was that known as the Ancient Society of College Youths, whose name, it has been claimed, was "derived from the place where the first members were accustomed to meet and practice, — St. Martin's, *College Hill*, Upper Thames Street."<sup>18</sup> The College Youths were, however, not founded until 1637, and scholars have agreed in viewing that society as a resuscitation of an earlier society known as the "Schollers of Chepesyde."<sup>19</sup> According to Raven,

In the library of All Souls' College, Oxford, is a MS. entitled "Orders conceyved and agreed upon by the Company exercising the arte of ringing, knowne and called by the name of the Schollers of Chepesyde, in London, begun and so continued from the second day of February, anno 1603."<sup>20</sup> The start seems to have been at Candlemas. The date of the rules, however, is 1610. They are to elect annually a Gennerall, four Wardens and a Warner, whose function was most likely to call bobs, etc.<sup>21</sup>

Although the All Souls' manuscript claims 1603 for the date of its origin, this society of amateur ringers was, it may be presumed from its drawing up definite rules and orders, reëstablishing itself in 1610. No society responsible for so much noise could have failed to attract public notice. As Chepeside was as frequently as not referred to as "West Chepe," it is quite possible that the author intended the audience to recognize the "Schollers of Chepesyde" or West Chepe in "the worshipful company of the knights o' the west."

BALDWIN MAXWELL

*The University of Iowa*

---

<sup>17</sup> *Church Bells of Devon*, p. 229.

<sup>18</sup> Canon Thompson, *Southward Cathedral*, p. 326; Strutt (Methuen edition), p. 236. Ellacombe (*op. cit.*, p. 231) observes, however, that "The place called 'College Hill' did not exist before the great fire of 1666."

<sup>19</sup> Raven, *Bells of England*, p. 246; Ellacombe, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

<sup>20</sup> MS. cxix.

<sup>21</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 245; Ellacombe, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

## BEATRICE: "MY LADY DISDAIN"

One major deviation from the sources<sup>1</sup> of Shakespeare's *Much Ado* is the exchange of an insipid and incidental character for the glib and lively Beatrice. She becomes, moreover, an integral part of his play: her uncle and guardian, Leonato, holds genuine affection for her; the Prince proposes marriage to her; Benedick woos and weds her; and Beatrice herself is the most steadfast champion of Hero's virtue. Apparently critics attach little significance to this considerable addition. Commentators from Fletcher<sup>2</sup> to Mackenzie<sup>3</sup> obscure Beatrice among Shakespeare's universal characters. Scott's study<sup>4</sup> of a generation ago suggests the possibility of Countess Emilia Pia as a prototype; but, since the two are similar only in their loquacity, this suggestion hardly illuminates her character. Stoll is interested in her only as one of a group; like other critics, he interprets her chatter as anti-matrimonial, and he consequently pronounces her inconsistent: she is just another dramatic convention in Shakespeare's plays<sup>5</sup> and, like "most of Shakespeare's women," she is "less real than romantic"; they "are not fully presented in the round and have few connections with the world as we know it."<sup>6</sup> Is the quick and witty Beatrice, indeed, no more than this? Is she an "enemy of love," as is popularly believed? The purpose of this study is to ascertain what connection Beatrice did have with the Elizabethan world, thereby determining the significance of her extensive and important position in the play.

During the Renaissance a few writers still questioned even the possibility of woman's soul.<sup>7</sup> Generally, however, she was conceded this possession; but, as in the Middle Ages, most people denied her a "private will."<sup>8</sup> Her God-given privilege was to care for

<sup>1</sup> *Much Ado About Nothing*, Furness's New Variorum Ed., pp. 311-329.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>3</sup> Agnes Mure Mackenzie, *The Women in Shakespeare's Plays*, 1924, p. 124.

<sup>4</sup> Mary Augusta Scott, "The Book of the Courtyer," *PMLA.*, xvi, 501.

<sup>5</sup> E. E. Stoll, *Shakespeare Studies*, 1927, p. 439.

<sup>6</sup> E. E. Stoll, *MLN.*, xxiii, 145.

<sup>7</sup> C. L. Powell, *English Domestic Relations 1485-1653*, 1917, p. 150.

<sup>8</sup> Edmund Tilney, *A Brief and Pleasant Discourse of Duties in Marriage*, 1568, sig. Bvi<sup>a</sup>.

her husband and his home;<sup>9</sup> and she was supposed to live only for him and as part of his family. Occasionally, however, an English writer, as, for example, Henrie Smith,<sup>10</sup> agreed with Castiglione that the ideal woman should have "Ready wit . . . , a pleasing affability, by which she can entertain all kinds of men with pleasing and seemly conversation."<sup>11</sup> Such sentiment together with the spread of education, the fall of the feudal lords, and the prestige of Queen Elizabeth increased freedom for women who desired it. These insinuated themselves "into every company." There is, indeed, "no feasting, banqueting, reveling, nor any other merry making, but my Lady New Fashions is a principal guest."<sup>12</sup> That a conspicuous number of women availed themselves of these new privileges, the critics leave no doubt; they rebuked them for going "like a Peacocke,"<sup>13</sup> speaking "much" but expressing "little,"<sup>14</sup> employing "evill and uncomely language,"<sup>15</sup> and giving "too easie raines to liberty; making pleasure their vocation";<sup>16</sup> and foreigners, indeed, "seeing the familiar conversation of" the English "Woemen" did "repute them for harlots."<sup>17</sup> Since, however, this growth of "Freedome" among the women decreased masculine predominance, the men, in theory at least, advocated and popularized the conception that the ideal wife did not frequent "publick" places but served her husband silently and devotedly. Overbury well expresses the masculine fear of "learning and pregnant wit" in a wife; they endanger the matrimonial ship by adding "not more ballast but more sail."<sup>18</sup>

How truly Elizabethan then is Leonato's rebuke of Beatrice for her much chatter. "By my troth Neece, thou wilt never get

<sup>9</sup> See Nadine Page, "The Public Repudiation of Hero," *PMLA*, forthcoming.

<sup>10</sup> Henrie Smith, *A Preparative to Marriage*, 1591, p. 34.

<sup>11</sup> T. F. Crane, *Italian Social Customs of the Sixteenth Century*, 1927, p. 200.

<sup>12</sup> Barnabe Rich, *My Ladies Looking Glasse*, 1616, p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> Joseph Swetman, *The Araignment of Lewd, Idle, Froward, etc.*, 1615, p. 9.

<sup>14</sup> Richard Braithwait, *The English Gentlewoman*, 1631, p. 51.

<sup>15</sup> Barnabe Rich, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

<sup>16</sup> Richard Braithwait, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

<sup>17</sup> G. B. Harrison, *Description of England in Shakespeare's Youth*, 1908, p. 247.

<sup>18</sup> C. L. Powell, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

thee a husband, if thou be so shrewd of thy tongue" (II, i, 19). Her conversation, furthermore, reflects the frequent grossness of contemporary talk; she comments in an adolescent manner on men's beards (II, i, 29); she censures men rudely in the presence of her elderly uncles (II, i, 56); she does not even let Hero make her own answers (II, i, 50); she is sarcastic (I, i, 135) and occasionally even coarse (II, i, 136; III, iv, 45). Benedick accuses her of getting her wit from the "Hundred Merry Tales" (II, i, 124) and characterizes her as "the infernal Ate in good apparel" (II, i, 244); and sometimes she "speaks poinards and every word stabs" (II, i, 236). Her cousin, Hero, like Viola, seeks the vantage ground of obvious dependence; but Beatrice, like Olivia,<sup>19</sup> is definitely the emancipated woman of the Renaissance.

The freedom of the women of this period was limited, however. For example, they did not claim economic independence; and, had they wished to, they could not have financed the liberties they enjoyed. Jonson scornfully defines this new group as "an order between courtiers and country-madams, that live upon their husbands."<sup>20</sup> Since marriage furnished a means of sustenance, they accepted it. These "free" women, however, were learning to discriminate among men. Formerly, the parents had maintained absolute authority in the choice of husbands for their daughters, the selection being made on the social and economic advantages to be derived.<sup>21</sup> Much consequent unhappiness, as in the case of Penelope Devereux and Lord Rich, who was three times her age, exposed the evils of this old system. The literature of the period began not only to criticize these dictated marriages but also to counsel toward more congenial ones. An actual case, for instance, which in 1590 created much sentiment, gave entire sympathy to a young girl condemned to die for the murder of her rich old husband. A ballad on the affair reflects this change in attitude.

On knees I prayed they would not me constrain;  
With tears I cried their purpose to refrain;  
With sighs and sobs I did them often move,  
I might not wed wheras I could not love.

. . . . .

<sup>19</sup> See J. W. Draper, "The Wooing of Olivia," *Neophil.*, about to appear.

<sup>20</sup> Ben Jonson, *Silent Woman*, III, i.

<sup>21</sup> See Nadine Page, *op. cit.*, for a full treatment of such references as: Joseph Swetman, *op. cit.*, p. 43, and Wm. Gouge, *Domesticall Duties*, 1627, p. 447.



You parents fond, that greedy-minded be,  
 And seek to graff upon the golden tree,  
 Consider well and rightful judges be,  
 And give you doom 'twixt parents' love and me.  
 I was their child and bound for to obey,

Regard my grief and mark my woeful end  
 But to your children be a better friend.<sup>22</sup>

It now became good form for the suitor to gain first the favor of the maiden and later the consent of her parents.<sup>23</sup>

Beatrice seems indeed to be the symbol of these changing conditions. Her constant banter reveals no glorification of the single life, no reluctance to take up the burdens of matrimony, no evidence, in fact, that she believed they existed, and, furthermore, no criticism of marriage itself. She is, in truth, not anti-matrimonial, as is popularly alleged. She offers every evidence, however, of exercising much discrimination in the choosing of her husband: "Would it not grieve a woman to be over-mastered with a piece of valiant dust? to make an account of her life to a clod of wayward marl?" (II, i, 57). Such criticism, indeed, has developed into a habit with her of analysing all men. She subtly warns Hero that because of the Prince's importance one might desperately rue a marriage with him (II, i, 66). She does not alter this opinion when he later proposes to her; instead she tosses him the clever refusal of honest flattery, "Your Grace is too costly to weare everie day" (II, i, 313). Not in any one man does she find all the traits she desires; but she would not be averse to one who had "half of Signior Benedicks tongue in Count Johns mouth, and half Count Johns melancholy in Signior Benedicks face . . . with a good legge, and a good foot . . . and money enough in his purse"; she admits, "such a man would winne any woman in the world, if he could get her good will" (II, i, 13 ff.). Just this difficulty, getting the "good will" of Beatrice, made Benedick's wooing of her complex and difficult. At the beginning of the play the two are not new acquaintances. Already he is in an outward disfavor with her that may well be the prologue to feminine approval. She taunts him with being insincere: she alludes to his eating his

<sup>22</sup> G. B. Harrison, *England in Shakespeare's Day*, 1928, p. 143.

<sup>23</sup> R. Snowsel, *Conjugal Duty*, 1610, pp. 195-196; also R(obert) C(arr), *A Godly Forme of Houshold Government*, 1621, sigs. G 4 et seq.

words (iv, i, 286); confides that he "foreswore on Tuesday morning" a thing he swore to her on Monday night (v, i, 172); and declares to Don Pedro his faithlessness as a lover: "Indeed, my lord, he lent it (his heart) mee a while; and I gave him use for it, a double heart for a single one, marry once before he wonne it of mee, with false dice, therefore your Grace may well say I have lost it" (ii, i, 267). Then from the very beginning of the play, therefore, she is on the alert for evidence of strength of manhood in Benedick. This continuous weighing of his qualities reaches a climax after Hero's repudiation: because of Benedick's former insincerity, actual or supposed, Beatrice questions the avowal of his love (iv, i, 307); when he is reluctant to prove it by killing his friend, Claudio, she becomes bitterly cynical, not merely theatrical, as some might believe. A man "hath slandered, scorned, dishonoured" her "kinswoman," and yet the suitor who swears he loves her will not revenge the wrong. Her impressions accumulated from observation of the general integrity of men furnishes in this emotional crisis the conclusion: "Manhood is melted into cursies, valour into complement, and men are onelie turned to tongue, and trim ones too: he is now as valiant as Hercules, that only tells a lie and sweares it." No one dictates a marriage for this young lady; not until Benedick convinces her that he is sincere and that he will fight to aid defeated virtue does she accept him. Further realism appears when, as a matter of form, he asks Leonato's consent to their marriage (v, iv, 23).

By revealing Beatrice's doubt of Benedick's sincerity and her frequent analysis of the integrity of men, this study corrects a former inaccuracy of interpretation: she is not anti-matrimonial, but merely discriminating in her choice of a husband. This corrected interpretation, moreover, removes the alleged inconsistency in her character. She is not one of Shakespeare's "romantic dreams," but a character well developed according to the Renaissance details of the "free" woman: she is not inhibitive; her talk is frequent and Elizabethan in nature; she knows the kind of a husband she does not want; and she answers her own proposals of marriage. As in the contemporaneous Falstaff plays,<sup>24</sup> *Twelfth Night*,<sup>25</sup> and *As You Like It*,<sup>26</sup> Shakespeare has altered the sources

<sup>24</sup> See J. W. Draper, "John Falstaff," *RES.*, viii, 414 ff.

<sup>25</sup> See J. W. Draper, "Olivia's Household," *PMLA.*, xlix, 797-806.

<sup>26</sup> See J. W. Draper, "Orlando, the Younger Brother," *PQ.*, xiii, 72 ff.

of *Much Ado* not only by supplying the low-life portrait of Dogberry,<sup>27</sup> but also, on a higher social plane, by enriching the courtly background with the brilliant depiction of "My Lady Disdain." His expansion and integration of the Beatrice rôle, indeed, has given not only closer unity but also a wider scope of realism to the play.

NADINE PAGE

*West Virginia University*

### "THE MASQUE OF THE MUSCOVITES" IN *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST*

In 1906 Mr. H. C. Hart<sup>1</sup> first pointed out a parallel between "The Masque of the Muscovites" in *Love's Labour's Lost* (v, ii) and Russian incidents in the Gray's Inn Revels of 1595. Other scholars, Mr. Dover Wilson and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch,<sup>2</sup> Sir E. K. Chambers,<sup>3</sup> and Mr. Rupert Taylor,<sup>4</sup> have since mentioned this relationship, Mr. Taylor advancing the parallel as one of his main arguments in support of 1596 as the date of composition. That the Gray's Inn Revels may have had some influence on Shakespeare's mind when he was composing or revising *Love's Labour's Lost* is possible, such a supposition being capable of neither proof nor disproof; but the conclusion that these Revels are the direct source of Shakespeare's masque and can thus be taken as proof of a date subsequent to 1595 would be exposed as an erroneous one if another, an earlier, and a more likely source for the masque were discovered.

Over one hundred and fifty years ago, Ritson<sup>5</sup> came near this

<sup>27</sup> See L. D. Frasure, "Shakespeare's Constables," *Anglia*, about to appear.

<sup>1</sup> English *Arden Edition* of Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost*. London: Methuen and Co., 1906, pp. xxvi-xxviii.

<sup>2</sup> *The New Shakespeare*, *Love's Labour's Lost*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1923, p. 172.

<sup>3</sup> *William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930, I, 335.

<sup>4</sup> *The Date of Love's Labour's Lost*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Preface and Ch. I.

<sup>5</sup> See Furness, H. H., *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Love's Labour's Lost*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1904, p. 243.

source by pointing out that in Hall's *Henry VIII* occurs the description of a masking performed by the young king and certain of his courtiers in which two lords were masked as Russians. Ritson quotes a short passage to substantiate his statement. Hall's *Chronicles*, King Henry VIII, and the year 1510 seem remote enough from Shakespeare—until we remember that exactly the same account that appeared in Hall was printed by Holinshed in 1587. And when we read the complete account, as printed by Holinshed, we cannot fail to be impressed by certain details.

On Shrouesundaie the same yeare, the king prepared a goodlie banket in the parlement chamber at Westminster, for all the ambassadors, which then were here out of diuerse realmes and countries. The banket being readie, the king leading the queene, entered into the chamber, then the ladies, ambassadours, and other noble men followed in order.

The king caused the queene to keepe the estate, and then sate the ambassadours and ladies, as they were marshalled by the K. who would not sit, but walked from place to place, making cheare to the queene and the strangers: suddenlie the king was gone. And shorlie [*sic*] after, his grace, with the earle of Essex, cam in appparelled after the Turkie fashion, in long robes of baudekin, powdered with gold, hats on their heds of crimsin veluet, with great rolles of gold, girded with two swords called cimiteries, hanging by great hauderiks of gold. Then next \* *came the lord Henrie earle of Wiltshire, and the lord Fitzwater, in two long gownes of yellow sattin, trauersed with white sattin, and in euerie band of white was a band of crimsin sattin after the fashion of Russia or Rusland, with furred hats of graie on their heads, either of them hauing an hatchet in their hands, and boots with pikes turned up.*

. . . The torchbearers were appparelled in crimsin sattin and greene, like Moreskoes, their faces blacke; and the king brought in a mummerie.

. . . After them entered six ladies, whereof two were appparelled in crimsin sattin and purple. . . . Their faces, necks, armes, and hands, couered in fine pleasants blacke; some call it Lumbardines, which is maruellous thin; so that the same ladies semed to be Nigers or blacke Mores.<sup>7</sup>

In this passage we have everything necessary to inspire Shakespeare's "Masque of the Muscovites." Here are nobles disguised as Russians and accompanied by servants with black faces; here is also the word, "blacke Mores." Shakespeare's stage direction in *Love's Labour's Lost*, is: "Enter Blackamoors with music. the Boy with a speech, and the rest of the Lords disguised." If the

\* The following italicized passage is the one quoted by Ritson.

<sup>7</sup> Holinshed, Raphael, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. London: 1587, III, 805.

young Shakespeare, writing a romantic comedy in the late 1580's or early 1590's, had come to the point where he wished to disguise his noble characters, his mind might readily have flashed back to the maskings practiced by Henry VIII, of which he had read in Holinshed's history. And besides, English interest in Russia at the time was great. Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* had appeared in 1589 containing an elaborate description of Russia and Russians, even describing minutely the dress of Russian noblemen.<sup>8</sup>

Looked at in this new light, "The Masque of the Muscovites" becomes no longer evidence of a late date for the composition of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

FRED SORENSEN

*Stanford University*

---

#### THE AUTHORSHIP OF *THE CHRISTMAS PRINCE*

In a manuscript in the library of St. John's College, Oxford, is preserved an account of the revels at the college during the Christmas season of 1607-08, together with the texts of eight dramatic pieces performed by the students at intervals during the festival. This manuscript, called for convenience *The Christmas Prince*, is of interest for a number of reasons: it commemorates the most ambitious experiment in dramatics recorded at any of the colleges; several of the plays seem to show the influence of *King Lear*, which may have been presented at Oxford in September of 1607 when the King's Company visited the city; the narrative sections throw light on the ancient custom of electing a mock ruler to preside at festivals; and the whole provides us with a charmingly familiar view of college life in Shakespeare's time, together with testimony of the fact that amateur theatricals have been attended by like calamities in all ages.

*The Christmas Prince* was first edited in its entirety by F. S. Boas and W. W. Greg, for the Malone Society in 1923. The editors were able to throw light upon the authorship of only one of

<sup>8</sup> MacLehose reprint of the 1598-1600 edition, III, 416-417. I am assured by G. B. Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages* (New York: American Geographical Society, 1928, pp. 128-29) that as far as Russia is concerned the 1589 edition was practically as complete as the 1598-1600 edition.

the eight plays in the manuscript; *Saturnalia*, assigned tentatively to one Owen Vertue, who had been elected to the office of 'Clarke of ye Signet and Chafer of Waxe' in the household of the mock Prince. It is possible now to determine the authorship of one additional play in the series, and to offer a conjecture concerning two others prepared for the festival but no longer extant. The last play in the St. John's College manuscript of *The Christmas Prince* is the English tragedy *Periander*. The present writer has come upon a second manuscript of *Periander* at the Folger Shakespeare Library, and this manuscript bears upon its title-page the explicit statement, "made bye Mr. John Sansburye."

John Sansbury or Sandsbury, brief biographical notices of whom appear in *Alumni Oxonienses* and the *DNB.*, was born in 1576, and matriculated at St. John's as a commoner of London in 1593, having received his preparation in Merchant Taylor's School. He graduated B. A. in 1597, M. A. in 1601, and D. D. in 1608. In 1607 or 1608 he became vicar of St. Giles, Oxford; and he died in January, 1610. Sansbury's name appears, though very inconspicuously in the St. John's College manuscript of *The Christmas Prince*. He was assessed ten shillings toward the maintenance of the mock court and its activities, his name appearing at line 241, eleventh in a list of the members of the college beginning with the "Præsidents," and including in sixth place the name of the future notable "Mr. Laude"—likewise assessed ten shillings.

It is tempting to be wise after the event, and to assert that there is sufficient evidence available to suggest Sansbury's authorship of parts of *The Christmas Prince* even without reference to his name on the Folger manuscript. The single work by which he has been known is the rare and valuable little book called *Ilium in Italiam. Oxonia ad Protectionem Regis sui omnium optimi filia pedisequa*, published in Oxford in 1608. This contains reproductions of the arms of the various colleges, each explained by nine Latin hexameters. It appears that the author had made himself something of an authority on Oxford University history. Now at line 9292 of *The Christmas Prince* appears a notice of one of the shows intended but not performed, "The triumph of all the ffounders of the Colledges in Oxford"; and beginning at line 4135 appears the following:

The sunedy after beeing the last day of the Vacation and the tenth day

of the moneth two shewes were priuately performed in the Lodging the one presently after dinner called *Somnium fundatoris* vid. The tradicion that wee have concerning the three trees that wee have in the præsidēt his garden this interlude by the reason of the death of him that made it, not long after was lost, and so could not bee heere inserted but it was very well liked and so wel deserved for that it was both wel penned and well acted.

The concern of the projected "Triumph" and of *Somnium fundatoris*, like Sansbury's *Ilium in Italianum*, with the history and legend of Oxford University origins, and Sansbury's death in January, 1610, suggest that he may have been the author of the two lost shows as well as of *Periander*. January, 1610, may seem too far removed from the holiday season of 1607-08 to fit the phrase "not long after," but our ideas of time are relative; too, it is quite possible that the collecting of the plays into the commemorative volume may have been delayed for several years. The death in 1608 of John Alder, one of the undergraduates of the college, was enough to suggest to the editors of the Malone Society edition that this promising youth was the author of *Somnium fundatoris*.

There is further evidence connecting Sansbury with *The Christmas Prince*. In *Athenae Oxonienses*, II, 58, Anthony à Wood adds after a notice of Sansbury's *Ilium in Italianum* mention of further works: "Tragediæ diversæ MS. Acted several times by the scholars of the aforesaid coll, in the common refectory in the time of Christmas." Bliss, the editor of *Athenae Oxonienses*, commends Wood's diligence in research at this point, and suggests that he had got his information from a manuscript catalogue of the fellows and scholars of St. John's, where Sansbury's literary activity is noticed in the following terms: "Poeta ingeniosissimus, cuius præter Tragædias multas apud nos actas etiâ Libellus prodijt de Insignibus collegiorû, additis Epigrammatis." It is clear, however, that Wood must have had sources of information other than this.

The characteristic care with which Boas and Greg have edited *The Christmas Prince*, and the *apparatus* which they have included in their volume, make it possible to compare the Folger manuscript with the manuscript at St. John's College. The Folger *Periander* is bound together with five other manuscripts of dramatic pieces, none of which seem to have any connection with *The Christmas Prince* but four of which are otherwise unknown and would repay

study by anyone interested in academic drama. The pieces besides *Periander* are: *Risus Anglicanus*, in Latin; *A Christmas Messe*, about 600 lines in length and dated 1619; *Heteroclitanonalmomia*, in English and dated 1613; *Gigantomachia, or Worke for Jupiter*, in English and about 600 lines in length; and finally, Jonson's *Christmas his Showe* [*Christmas his Mask*], 1615. The *Periander* is written in an upright Italian hand that corresponds exactly with none of those reproduced in the plates of the Boas and Greg edition. The watermark of the paper corresponds with neither of those of the St. John's College manuscript, and although the paper is ruled after the same fashion as that of the St. John's College copy the ruling is in black instead of in red ink. The title-page and its verso, which contains the *dramatis personae*, is written in an ugly but legible English hand. The title-page contains, in addition to the name of the play and the author, an indication of the provenance of the manuscript. Written lengthwise along the outer edge of the page are the words, "Englishs Fairre copy." English I conjecture to be the John English who was an undergraduate of the College, and the "Lrd Cheife-Iustice Examener of all causes capitall" in the household of the Prince.

A comparison of the two texts of *Periander* reveals the reassuring fact that the St. John's College manuscript was the one better fitted to editing without collation. The Folger manuscript omits many stage directions, and abbreviates most of the others. It contains only a rudimentary *dramatis personae*, and no induction. The body of the play itself is slightly abbreviated although the difference in length involves a total of only sixty lines.

In matters of orthography there is a marked divergence from the St. John's College manuscript. Differences in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization occur in every line, but here the impression conveyed is less of inferiority than of arbitrary preferences on the part of equally competent scribes. In its punctuation the Folger manuscript sometimes clarifies readings in the edited text. In many instances words and phrases are transposed within lines, and in a few instances lines themselves are transposed. In a few instances also there are slight differences in wording, but the reading of passages is rarely affected.

The Folger manuscript contains three lines omitted, probably by scribal accident, from the edited manuscript. After line 7399 of the latter should be interpolated:



Por: Would shee had not incensd your grace. Zo: I would  
 Shee had mist that blow. Per: Ye are dissemblers both.

After line 8070 should be interpolated:

Or any way releve him, wander, goe

In this instance, restoration of the line eliminates an obscurity in the passage. The Folger manuscript also contains a different last line in the Epilogue:

By many hands he may relieue agayne.

But beneath this is written the last line which appears in the St. John's College manuscript.

The St. John's College manuscript in lines 7640, 7643, 7833, 7860, 8497, 8760, 8761, and 9030-9036, preserves verses omitted from the Folger manuscript, also probably by scribal accident. Several additional passages are omitted from the Folger manuscript evidently from design. These are the deviation to facetiousness at the end of III, iv, 8351-8370; and more interesting, certain portions of IV, xi, 8470-8474, and of IV, xii, 8513-8537. In the latter instances the speeches omitted are those in which Neotinus plays Fool to Lycophron's King Lear. The deletion, if it was that, impairs to some extent the parallelism, to which Boas and Greg have called attention, between this portion of *Periander* and Shakespeare's tragedy. This offers us a field for speculation: perhaps the scholar of Oxford feared, after second thought, that he had paid too high a compliment of imitation to the repertory of the common players from London.<sup>1</sup>

ALFRED HARBAGE

*University of Pennsylvania*

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to acknowledge the helpfulness of the officials of the Folger Shakespeare Library, that of Dr. Joseph Q. Adams in permitting me to have made photostats of *Periander*, and that of Dr. Giles E. Dawson in corresponding with me and submitting to my questions about the Folger manuscripts.

PEELE'S *DESCENSUS ASTRAEAE* AND MARLOWE'S  
*EDWARD II*

So far as I can discover, no one has pointed out the following parallel between Peele's *Descensus Astraeae* and Marlowe's *Edward II*. *Descensus Astraeae*, line 39: "In peace triumphant, fortunate in wars"; *Edward II*, line 1416: "In peace triumphant, fortunate in warres." This parallel has some bearing on the date of composition of *Edward II*, since the date of the occasion for which Peele wrote *Descensus Astraeae* was October 29, 1591. Whether Peele or Marlowe was the borrower remains to be determined.

ARTHUR M. SAMPLEY

*Sul Ross State Teachers College, Alpine, Texas*

THE POUSSIN DOCTOR

It is certain that Charles Davenant is referred to in the Prologue to Tom Brown's *The Stage Beaux toss'd in a Blanket* (1704): "A full Explanation of the Poussin Doctor's Book, Spoken by one Dress'd one half like a Non-con Parson, and the Other like an Orthodox Divine." But how the author of *Peace at Home and War Abroad* came to be called the Poussin Doctor is a story out of Anglo-French politics remaining to be told.<sup>1</sup> The sobriquet, far from complimentary when imposed upon Davenant in 1701, was, no doubt, as annoying to him in 1704 as it was three years earlier when he brought action against Sir Richard Holford, a master of chancery, for calling him "French pensioner, the Poussin Doctor, count Tallards mercenary writer, &c."<sup>2</sup> It called up memories of a strange evening in London when Gallic cleverness trapped three unsuspecting Englishmen whose hearts were set upon a political future.

<sup>1</sup> Abel Boyer, *The History of King William the Third* (1703), III, summarizes parts of the story, but gives an incomplete account. See pp. 467, 468, and 501. See also Boyer's *An Impartial History of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Bills* (1717), pp. 2, 40, and 41.

<sup>2</sup> Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs* (Oxford: At the University Press, 1857), v, 116.

Events leading up to that unlucky meeting may be summarized briefly from newspapers and tracts. Upon being recalled in April, 1701, the French ambassador left a M. Poussin to take care of his affairs until his King appointed a new ambassador.<sup>3</sup> In September of the same year when, upon the death of King James, the pretended Prince of Wales was proclaimed at St. Germain "King of England, Scotland and Ireland" by the name of James III, M. Poussin was ordered to leave the Kingdom as soon as possible.<sup>4</sup>

Between four and five, on the afternoon of September 23, 1701, Charles Davenant, author and Doctor of Laws, was in his chambers in Grey's Inn when a porter came to him with a letter, requesting his presence at the House of M. Paulet in the Hay-Market (the Blew Posts) for the secret consideration of matters of grave import. Davenant, obeying, found himself at the Blew Posts with two others of his acquaintance in a strange company; but since one of the strangers seemed well acquainted with their characters, each of the three thought the strangers were known to the other two. After some pleasing converse, the most talkative stranger took a serious air and told his guests that the French court had been informed that Dr. Davenant was "treating with the house of Austria." His words are said to have angered Davenant, who threatened to answer through the press. The argument growing more heated thereupon and the Stranger persisting, another of the party (the Spanish Agent) called out: "*Monsieur Poussin chang [sic] the discourse.*"<sup>5</sup> At this name, Poussin, the three "Worthy members" started and demanded who the Stranger was. Their mysterious host then confessed that he was Poussin, that he had that day been ordered to leave the Kingdom, but that he "durst not see his Masters Face unless he had first paid his respects to Persons of their great consideration."<sup>6</sup> With the words, "Oh *Hammond* we are undone, some Cursed Whigs of the new Stamp

<sup>3</sup> *The English Post*, No. 82; *The Flying Post*, No. 929; *The London Post*, No. 293; *The Post Boy*, No. 924.

<sup>4</sup> *The English Post*, No. 149; *The Flying Post*, No. 999; *The Post Boy*, Nos. 991 and 994; *The Post Man*, Nos. 877, 878, and 880.

<sup>5</sup> *A full and true Relation of a horrid and detestable Conspiracy against the Lives, Estates and Reputations of Three Worthy Members of this present Parliament, which God long preserve* (British Museum, 8122. i. 39).

<sup>6</sup> *A full and true Relation of a horrid and detestable Conspiracy, etc.*

have drawn us into this Snare," Dr. Charles Davenant fled the door. Thenceforth he was called the "Poussin Doctor," and the press was not willing to let him forget his evening at the Blew Posts, as the following titles indicate:

A Vindication of Dr. Charles Davenant, Anthony Hammond, Esq; and John Tredenham, Esq; from the Scurrilous Reflections casts [*sic*] upon them in a Late Paper, called a Full and True Relation of a Horrid and Detestable Conspiracy against the Lives, Estates, and Reputations of Three Worthy Members of this present Parliament. The Whole Answer'd Paragraph by Paragraph (*The Post Boy*, Nov. 13-15, 1701).

The Tories great Doubts and Difficulties fully resolv'd by more important Doubts and Difficulties; With some Queries about Monsieur Poussin's paying his Foy to three Members of the H—— of C——s, 1701. (British Museum, 8122. i. 39.)

England's Late Jury. A Satyr: with the Counter-Part, In Answer to it. To which is added, A Scandalous Dialogue between Monsieur *Shaccoo* and the *Poussin Doctor*: With the Vindication of those two worthy Persons therein Abus'd, 1702. (British Museum, 11631. bb. 231.)

A Full Explanation of the Poussin Doctor's Book: Prologue to Tom Brown's *The Stage Beaux toss'd in a Blanket*, 1704.

AUTREY NELL WILEY

*The Texas State College for Women*

### NOTES ON *FULGENS AND LUCRES*

It is probable that, owing to the scarcity of the Huntington reprint<sup>1</sup> of Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucres*, the Oxford edition<sup>2</sup> will be the text most used by students. The Oxford reprint is modernized in several respects but the following variations are not covered by the customary practice of the editors:

*BR*, I, 112: Hereuppon; *Q*: Here vpp on. *BR*, I, 118: these ye.11.men sholde have pre-eminence; *Q*: these.11.men sholde have ye preeminence. *BR*, I, 176: this matter to procede; *Q*: this matier to procede. *BR*, I, 231: The benefyts; *Q*: The benefytes. *BR*, II, 563: an . L . or twayne; *Q*: an.C.or twayne.<sup>3</sup> *BR*, II, 603: U pon the whiche; *Q*: Up on the whiche.

<sup>1</sup> Introduction by Seymour de Ricci, New York, 1920. Designated as *Q* in this study. I am indebted to Mr. C. K. Edmonds, bibliographer at the Huntington library, for checking my *Q* readings with the original text.

<sup>2</sup> Edited by F. S. Boas and A. W. Reed, 1926. Designated here as *BR*.

<sup>3</sup> See *BR*, I, 968: I woot where is an . c . l . in store.

*BR*, II, 921: Shortely here we make an end; *Q*: Shortely here we make and end.

The editors of the Oxford edition have supplied several necessary stage directions to those present in the original. The following additions seem necessary, however:

After *BR*, I, 632: [*Intrat B*].

II, 354: [*Intrat Cornelius*].

II, 809: [*Eweat Lucres*].

Mr. Reed believes that the characters A and B are boys,<sup>4</sup> while the cast of characters supplied in the Oxford edition designates them as "youths." The only evidence that either A or B is a youngster is the line: "Go sone and bidde them come thens anone." (*BR*, II, 385.) There is no indication, however, that B is in the action from the time that he leaves the stage after line 307 until the mummers enter, after line 386. A does not appear between lines 355 and 829. It is unlikely that Cornelius addresses B as "sone," for the latter remarks one line later that one of the mummers has a sore mouth, a fact which he would hardly have had time to learn in so short a time. Several times during the play the characters address members of the audience, and the "sone" may well refer to some youth, possibly a page, standing near the performers. It seems probable that the direction after *BR*, II, 386, should be amended to read "[*Intrant B et mummers*]."

CLAUDE E. JONES

*Baltimore, Maryland*

---

#### AN UNPUBLISHED JOHNSON LETTER CONCERNING PERCY'S *RELIQUES*

An unpublished letter from Samuel Johnson to Thomas Percy, discussing the terms of payment for Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, has been found in the Charles A. Brown collection of autographs and manuscripts in the University of Rochester library. This letter throws additional light upon the facts of the publication of the book as stated by Mr. L. B. Powell in the *Trans-*

<sup>4</sup> *The beginnings of English secular and romantic drama*, London, 1922 (Shakes. Assoc. papers, no. 7), p. 9.

*actions of the Bibliographic Society*,<sup>1</sup> and shows that Johnson's interest in the work was more personal and direct than has hitherto been known. In addition, the letter comes from a period of Johnson's life from which few letters have been preserved. It reads as follows:

To the Revd Mr Percy  
at Easton Mauduit

by Castle Ashby bag. Northamptonshire

Dear Sir

That I have neglected so long to write to you is a reason why I should neglect no longer.<sup>2</sup> I will not trouble you with apologies, but tell you, what I can tell with great truth, that I am very sorry for all appearance of disrespect, and hope to avoid it for the future, and shall think it a favour to hear that you forgive me.

Your friend<sup>3</sup> called on me with Mr Dodsley's offer which I think moderately good, that is, not so good as might be hoped, nor so bad as might be feared. I think he might afford to advance you for the copy two pounds a sheet to be reckoned to the expenses, which when the profits come to be divided will amount only to one pound given to you only that you will have the immediate use of two pounds. I will explain this by a calculation, both ways. Suppose a volume to consist of twelve sheets, the expense of printing and publishing is to be three pounds ten shillings a sheet and the profit as set down in such case

	12 sheets	12 sheets	
Paper, print &c	42-0-0	42-0-0	Paper &c
Editor	24-0-0	00-0-0	to Editor
	<hr/>		
	68-0-0		
Sold for	91-0-0	91-0-0	Sold for
Profit	23-0-0	49-0-0	Profit
To each	12-10-0 <sup>4</sup>	24-10-0	To each

Thus in one case you get 24 pound or 2 pound a sheet in the other 36 or three pounds a sheet and an earlier use of the money. Another point is to be considered, whether you bargain for the first edition only or for all

<sup>1</sup> *The Library*, 4th Series, Vol. ix, September, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> No earlier correspondence between Johnson and Percy is known. The present letter is from Percy's correspondence, and he may have destroyed other letters from Johnson.

<sup>3</sup> This person has not been identified.

<sup>4</sup> The first total in this column should be £66 instead of £68; the profit would thus be £25, and the final figure is correct as Johnson wrote it. He apparently wrote in haste, as shown also in the failure to use "pound" or "pounds" consistently.

future editions. If you are to share only in the first, your bargain ought to be the better. But upon the whole, I would not have you reject the offer as it is, for I know not, who will make a better. I will in another letter <sup>5</sup> tell you what may occur to me for the improvement of the work, and once more beg you to forgive, and procure Mrs Percy's forgiveness for

Dear Sir

Your most humble servant

Sam: Johnson

Oct 4. 1760

Mr. Powell writes that "By the end of October 1760 Shenstone . . . had assumed or been appointed to the office of supervisor" <sup>6</sup> in preparing the ballads for publication. The present letter of Johnson's would seem to indicate that Percy had also found someone to take over the task of arranging terms with the printer. However that may be, Percy wrote to William Shenstone on November 27, 1760:

You will perhaps be surprised when I tell you, that Mr. Dodsley & I have broke off all treaty on the subject of the old Ballads. James Dodsley is generous enough & offered me terms that would have repaid my Labour, but his brother (who, if you remember, had never much opinion of the work) has, I suppose, persuaded him to desist, for the other has receded from his own offers and we are now quite off, as the trading term is . . . I am now in treaty with another bookseller, who I hope will be more steady in his resolutions and better apprized of the value of the work; as soon as we have agreed upon terms I shall prosecute the business with all vigour." <sup>7</sup>

The break with Dodsley evidently came in the middle of November, for on November 10, 1760, Shenstone wrote to Percy that he had "been mentioning y<sup>r</sup> Quere to M<sup>r</sup> Dodsley, about y<sup>r</sup> argument or Introduction to each ballad." <sup>8</sup> This was Robert Dodsley, who was at the time staying with the Shenstone, but returned to London within two days after Shenstone wrote this letter. <sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> This other letter has not been located; it may never have been written, or Percy may have destroyed it.

<sup>6</sup> Powell, p. 116.

<sup>7</sup> Hecht, Hans, ed., *Thomas Percy und William Shenstone* (Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte, Strassburg, 1909), p. 48.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>9</sup> It is strange that Percy's letter of November 27, 1760, not all of which is quoted here, should have been so bitter against Robert Dodsley, whom he knew to be a particular friend of Shenstone's (cf. Hecht, p. 41). In-

On November 29, 1760, two days after Percy had written to Shenstone telling of his break with Dodsley, Johnson wrote Percy of his visit to Andrew Millar and of that gentleman's willingness to pay one hundred guineas for Percy's work. Johnson went on to say:

There is only one thing which I dislike. He wants the Sheets that are in my hands to shew to I know not whom. In that there is yet some danger. If we had not had this Specimen I think we should have immediately bargained.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps after all the bargain is made. You will know from his own Letter, which he promised me to write tonight, and which, if he writes it, will make this superfluous.<sup>11</sup> But, this business being of moment, I would not appear to neglect it.

But as it turned out, the bargain was made with Dodsley, for "after a council of war with Mr. Johnson,"<sup>12</sup> Percy closed with Dodsley on May 22, 1761, and wrote to Shenstone,

And now, Sir, let me inform you, that the work is at length to come out of Mr Dodsley's shop. He has thought better of the scheme & has come up to my terms, which Mr Millar would indeed have done as to money, but he wanted to lay me under some difficulties about the execution, that prevented us from coming to an agreement. My terms, if 3 vols, are to be 100 Guineas, if 2 only, 70*£*.<sup>13</sup>

The same day Percy confided to his diary, "Sold Dodsley my old Ballads,"<sup>14</sup> and the next day Dodsley took him to see Hughes, the printer.

deed, in a letter dated September, 1760 (*ibid.*, 42-3), Percy sent Dodsley his compliments. This subsequent sharp criticism of his friend's friend may have caused a break between Percy and Shenstone, for there is a gap in their correspondence between November 27, 1760, and April, 1761, a gap which cannot be entirely explained by Shenstone's illness during the winter. Shenstone's letter dated Saturday, April, 1761 (*ibid.*, 51), addresses Percy in the third person, but his letter of April 24, 1761 (*ibid.*, 52-3), is cordial enough, although the two seem never to have regained their old intimacy (cf. *ibid.*, 32). It is possible that sometime in April, 1761, Percy ate humble pie, and later destroyed the letter to Shenstone in which he did so.

<sup>10</sup> From these sentences it would appear that Dodsley had printed several trial sheets of ballads.

<sup>11</sup> This promised letter of Millar's seems not yet to have been found, if, indeed, it was ever written. That he and Percy corresponded is clear from what follows.

<sup>12</sup> Powell, p. 117.

<sup>13</sup> Hecht, p. 54.

<sup>14</sup> Powell, p. 117.



From these facts it is possible to reconstruct the probable early history of the printing of the *Reliques*. Percy had been in touch with Dodsley, who offered him half profits on the work.<sup>15</sup> Then in September a friend of Percy's called on Johnson and asked his opinion of the offer. Johnson wrote Percy the letter which is now in the Brown collection, advising Percy to ask for what, on the basis of three volumes, amounted to approximately one hundred guineas. Dodsley tentatively accepted these terms, and struck off several specimen sheets. In the early part of November Robert Dodsley returned to London from Shenstone's estate, feeling that James Dodsley had made a bad bargain. James Dodsley and Percy broke with each other and Percy offered the work to Andrew Millar through Johnson. Millar was willing to pay one hundred guineas for the book, but according to Percy, he made some stipulations which were distasteful to the compiler. In the meantime, James Dodsley was won over (perhaps by Johnson, although we have as yet no way of making sure) and Percy signed with Dodsley on May 22, 1761, the book eventually appearing in three volumes on February 14, 1765.<sup>16</sup>

ROBERT F. METZDORF

Rochester, New York

## SOUTHEY AND *TALES OF WONDER*

In 1799, when M. G. Lewis was collecting material for his *Tales of Wonder*, Southey wrote to William Taylor of Norwich, "Lewis, the Monk-man, is about to publish a compilation of ballads. . . . He has applied to me for some of mine."<sup>1</sup> If Southey replied to the request, his answer has not been printed, but the presence in the *Tales*, published in 1801, of eight of Southey's ballads would seem sufficient evidence of his coöperation.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>15</sup> Dodsley's papers might throw light on this entire affair. The disposition of his effects is noted in Nichols's *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, VII, 30.

<sup>16</sup> Willinsky, Margarete, *Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden* (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, XXII, Leipzig, 1932), p. 33.

<sup>1</sup> *Memoir of William Taylor of Norwich*, ed. J. W. Robberds, London, 1843, I, 281.

<sup>2</sup> *Tales of Wonder*, 2 vols., London. The ballads in question are 'The Old Woman of Berkeley,' 'Bishop Bruno,' 'Lord William,' 'The Painter

impression is strengthened by Scott's statement in his account of the genesis of Lewis's book,

I readily agreed to contribute the ballads of 'Glenfinlas' and of 'The Eve of Saint John,' with one or two others of less merit; and my friend Dr. Leyden became also a contributor. Mr. Southey, a tower of strength, added 'The Old Woman of Berkeley,' 'Lord William,' and several other interesting ballads of the same class, to the proposed collection.<sup>3</sup>

Thus it is generally taken for granted that Southey was one of Lewis's collaborators. There is evidence, however, that the fact was otherwise. On an end page of Alexander Dyce's copy of the *Tales* will be found the following note in Dyce's hand:

Wordsworth (whom I have heard quoting & laughing at Lewis's *Alonzo the brave*) told me, that, when this book first came out, it used to be called *Tales of Plunder*, because there was so little new in it; and that Southey felt rather indignant at Lewis for having reprinted *his* ballads in it without permission.<sup>4</sup>

The plunder-wonder witticism is well known, but the statement concerning the lack of Southey's permission is somewhat surprising. Of course the note is several removes from actuality—it is what Dyce said Wordsworth said Southey (probably) said. Dyce was careful in his statements, but neither of the future poets laureate entertained kindly feelings for Lewis as an author, and prejudice does not improve the accuracy of one's memory. Nevertheless, the evidence is against the compiler of *Tales of Wonder*, and, significantly enough, though the poems in that book by Scott, Leyden, Taylor, Colman, and Bunbury were retained in the second edition (1801), Southey's eight ballads were omitted. It need not be supposed that Lewis used them for the first edition contrary to the author's expressed wish. He probably received no answer to his letter, and took Southey's silence for consent, or at least for indifference.

LOUIS F. PECK

*Cambridge, Massachusetts*

of Florence' (i. e. 'The Pious Painter'), 'Donica,' 'Cornelius Agrippa's Bloody Book,' 'Rudiger,' 'St. Patrick's Purgatory.' Each is indicated in the *Tales* as Southey's work except 'St. Patrick's Purgatory,' of the authorship of which Lewis was ignorant. All had been published before (see the introductory notes to these ballads in *Poems of Robert Southey*, ed. M. H. Fitzgerald, London, 1909).

<sup>3</sup> 'Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad,' in *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, ed. T. F. Henderson, Edinburgh, 1932, iv, 48.

<sup>4</sup> Dyce Collection, 5788, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington.

## SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1933 AND 1934

Of the books which have come out since my last survey (*MLN.*, XLVIII, 378-96), the second edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary*<sup>1</sup> deserves first mention here by virtue of its great general interest. The first edition of this standard work was issued in 1909, and for 25 years served well the needs of the public. The present edition will also give good service, of course. And yet the linguist, if he goes through the book with care, must close it somewhat disappointed and depressed. Shadows of the past hang heavy over this dictionary, up-to-date though it is in many respects. The worst holdover from earlier *Websters* is the so-called Webster system of indicating pronunciation. This relic of a pre-scientific age seems to have proved too much for the writer of the "Guide to Pronunciation" (pp. xxii ff.) ; at any rate, we find him introducing into his admirable essay the standard phonetic symbols, alongside the traditional Websterian notation. Standard transcription does not appear, however, in the body of the dictionary, where, in consequence, the seeker after knowledge must wrestle with such monstrosities as *tât* for French *tête* and *ärt* for *art*. It is greatly to be hoped that the publishers may learn the error of their ways and conform in future editions to scientific practice in this important matter. The "Brief History of the English Language" (pp. lxxxii ff.) belongs to the past in another sense: it presents, with accuracy and distinction, the linguistic scholarship of an earlier period. In its point of view, terms, style, inclusions, omissions, echoes of forgotten controversies—in everything it bears the mark of bygone days. The very errors of an older generation of scholars are represented: thus, in the eleventh-century dating given to the Exeter Book (p. lxxxiv). This historical sketch may yet be read with pleasure and profit, but it is out of place in a book advertised (on the title-page) as "entirely new."

The body of the dictionary is made up of the so-called entries, i. e., the words or word-groups listed and defined separately. According to the publishers' announcement (opposite p. 3210), the entries number 600,000. It does not follow, however, that the new *Webster* gives us a multitude of words not to be found in other dictionaries. Thus, *native bread* is an independent entry in the new *Webster*, but it will be found in the *Shorter Oxford*, where it is entered, not separately but under *native*. Such multiplica-

<sup>1</sup> G. & C. Merriam Co., Springfield, Mass., 1934. Pp. xcvi + 3210. \$20.

tion of entries usually serves the convenience of the reader and often (as in the case of *native bread*) has its advantages from a strictly scientific point of view as well. When however one finds as a separate entry *stone wall* 'a wall made of stone' one is led to suspect that many of the entries serve only to bring the entry-count up to the 600,000 duly attained—a figure useful in advertising but impressive rather to the layman than to the linguist.

The reviewer of a dictionary must rest content with sampling its contents, and it is the part of fairness and wisdom alike to choose samples of which one has special knowledge. I have accordingly looked up in the new *Webster* the technical terms current in the field of philology,<sup>2</sup> terms in which, besides, the readers of this journal may be presumed to take particular interest. Let me begin with *philology* itself, the name of our discipline. We are engaged in the study of texts (philology in the narrow sense) and of the culture revealed by these texts (philology in the broad sense). In other words, we are, first and foremost, editors and interpreters of writings. The various definitions given in the new *Webster* fail to make this clear. Furthermore, not only is the popular confusion of *philology* with *linguistics* recorded (properly enough) in the form of a definition, but this definition is made the official meaning of *philology* as that term is employed in the dictionary itself. Workers in the linguistic field in this country have long distinguished between philology and linguistics, and in recent years the distinction has been sharpened by the organization and the activities of a separate learned body, the Linguistic Society of America, so that it is rather surprising (to say the least) to find the new *Webster* using, as its routine name for the linguistic discipline, a term which the linguists as a group repudiate. Be it noted, by the way, that the meaning 'an authority on linguistics or some branch thereof' is not recorded for *linguist* in the new *Webster*, though the word is often used in that sense (as on p. xxiii of the new *Webster* itself).

But let us go back to philology, and take up next the various divisions of that field of study. Greek and Latin studies (the stem from which vernacular studies branched) long ago took the name *classical philology*, a term not entered in the new *Webster*. *Semitics* and *Semitist* are recorded and correctly defined. *Germanics* and *Germanist* are also recorded, but inadequately defined. *Anglistics* does not appear, and though *Anglicist* is entered no definition of it

<sup>2</sup> See my papers on such terms in *RES.*, v, 173-85; *Anglia*, LV, 4 ff.; the *English Journal*, XVII, 311 ff., and XIX, 639-51; *Amer. Speech*, I, 371-7, v, 105 f. and 297 ff.; *Collitz Studies* (1930), pp. 324-9; and elsewhere.

is given, nor could its current meaning 'an authority on Anglistics' be inferred from the entry. *Anglist*, on the other hand, is admirably defined. *Celtist* is not given its correct definition of 'an authority on the Celts' but is defined, in purely linguistic terms, as 'a student of, or one versed in, Celtic.' The same definition is given (by implication) for *Celticist*, a term which properly means 'an authority on Celtic languages and literature.' *Hispanist* is (wrongly) defined in purely linguistic terms. *Hellenist* is clumsily explained as 'one skilled in the Greek language and literature,' while in the definition of *Latinist* no mention is made of literature. *Slavist* is ambiguously defined as 'a Slavic scholar.' Here the implied restriction to linguistics cannot be justified. The definition of *Sanskritist*, like that of *Latinist*, seems to exclude literary scholarship. *Icelandist* and *Icelandicist* are not entered.

The foregoing terms grew out of a division of the philological field according to the linguistic form of the writings under investigation. But other methods of division are possible. Thus, one may distinguish between the work of an editor and that of a literary historian. Important terms for an editor are *diplomatic text* and *critical text*, neither of which is entered in the new *Webster*. Under *text* the matter of critical editions is spoken of, but since Skeat's edition of Chaucer (which is eclectic rather than critical) is cited as an illustration, one cannot wonder that the account wants precision. *Literary history* is that branch of philology most cultivated nowadays, but it is not entered in the new *Webster*, though *literary language* and *literary property* appear. The historian of literature is greatly concerned with literary movements, such as the *Baroque*; the literary application of this term is not mentioned in the new *Webster*. Such a term as *Gothic novel*, confusing as it is to the layman, might well be added to the *Gothic* entries, which include *Gothic Chippendale* and *Gothic stitch*. Terms familiar in the history of ideas are likewise important to the historian of literature. Under *primitivism* one finds no distinction drawn between the chronological and cultural varieties, nor between the hard and soft varieties. *Chain of being* is not entered, though room was found for *chain of causation*. The definer of *romanticism* did not profit by the researches of Prof. A. O. Lovejoy. All philologists, finally, make more or less use of linguistic terms, even though they may not be professional linguists. The following omissions are therefore worthy of record here. Under *grammar* mention ought to have been made of *descriptive* as well as *historical grammar*. *Stylistics* 'the study of idiomatic expression' is not entered; see Mildred E. Lambert's series of papers in *American*

*Speech*, III and IV. The term *lenition* might to advantage have been recorded; in recent Celtic grammars this term has taken the place of the older *aspiration* (a term entered in the new *Webster* but not defined in the lenitive sense). I have found missing various phonological terms of my own invention, terms which I first used in my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic* (1923), but since these terms have not come into general currency I cannot justly reproach the editors for leaving them out. I have also translated with *rhythmics* the *Schallanalyse* of Sievers (*English Journal*, XIX, 645); this or some other name for the discipline will doubtless eventually win a place in the dictionary. By way of appendix I will call attention to three words conveniently taken together. The old term *Saxonist* 'an authority on Saxon England' is mistakenly defined as 'one versed in the Saxon language.' *English-speaking* is not entered. *Anglo-Saxon* is inadequately defined. I have elsewhere shown (*RES.*, v, 173 ff.) that this term means (1) 'English in its unrestricted sense,' (2) 'English in various restricted senses,' and (3) 'pre-English,' but in the new *Webster* the waters of definition are muddled so thoroughly that the reader is bound to gain ignorance rather than knowledge.

What of the dictionary as a whole? It must be said at once that other dictionaries, scrutinized in the same way, would hardly come out much better, except indeed as regards pronunciation, for the indication of which several dictionaries have systems of transcription more nearly scientific. At the same time, most Americans, I think, expect the best of a *Webster*, and feel let down when they do not get it. The great authority which the *Webster* has in the lexical field is an asset to the publishers, of course, but it is also a responsibility, something to be lived up to, not something to be exploited for what it is worth in dollars and cents. Such exploitation will in the end undermine the authority of the dictionary, for some day an American publisher will find the right editor-in-chief and will give him a free hand to prepare a dictionary designed for popular use but strictly scientific in its approach. Let us hope that it will be the publishers of *Webster's*, when they make ready for their next edition, who rise to the occasion.

Professor Holthausen's etymological dictionary of Old English, publication of which was begun in 1932, is now available as a whole; the last three *lieferungen* have come out since my last survey.<sup>3</sup> The final *lieferung* includes 28 pages of introductory matter and 12 pages of additions and corrections. The merits and demerits of the book were noted in *MLN.*, XLVIII, 381, and further

<sup>3</sup> F. Holthausen, *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, öht-ǵōian*, pp. 241-428. Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1933-4.

comment seems needless here. Two more volumes of the great Danish dictionary have appeared since my last survey.<sup>4</sup> Here as usual we have admirable work, combined with extraordinary rapidity of publication. The same may be said of Sir William Craigie's Scottish dictionary, two more parts of which are now out,<sup>5</sup> although the instalments in which this work appears are smaller than they would be if more money were to be had for the undertaking. I will mention here two other dictionaries of lesser scope: Mr. Braasch's lexical concordance of the OE *Genesis* and Mr. Zachrisson's Anglic word-list.<sup>6</sup> In the former the vocabulary of *Genesis A* and *B* has been fully recorded for the first time; in the latter, some 12,000 common English words have been listed in conventional spellings, together with respellings in parallel columns according to the Anglic system of orthography.

Mr. Partridge has got out two more books in the semantic field.<sup>7</sup> His volume of 1933 brings together a number of essays, most of them previously published in various periodicals. As a result, the book suffers somewhat from repetition; thus, parts of the material of the fourth essay reappear in the sixteenth. The best thing in the book is the essay on John Wesley's dictionary; I must confess I had never heard of this dictionary, and I found Mr. Partridge's discussion interesting and enlightening. I have noted a few details in various essays which call for comment. *Buddy*, p. 28, is better derived from *brother* than from *butty*. An example of American "back" slang (p. 36) is *dog* for *God* (in *dog gone* and the like). *Snack*, p. 43, is perhaps related to Norw. *snakeke* 'talk, chatter.' *Chenche*, p. 44, should be *schenche*, i.e. *shenche*; it is not a debased form, but a perfectly regular development of OE *scenc* 'drink' (not OE *scencan* 'pour'). *Bite*, sb. p. 48, is common in America in the sense 'small portion of food' and *bite* vb. meant 'eat' in early English (see *NED.*). *Philology*, p. 53, is misused; the proper term here is *semantics*. The derivation of *jolly* from *Fule* (p. 56) is phonetically inadmissible. *Witacre*, p. 69, can hardly be described as a "transition between *white acre* and

<sup>4</sup> *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, vol. xiv, *Midde-Nuværende*, pp. 713; vol. xv, *Ny-Overførster*, pp. 725. Copenhagen, 1933-4.

<sup>5</sup> W. A. Craigie, *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, Part III, *Berk-Broke*, pp. 241-360; Part IV, *Broket-Chamber*, pp. 361-480. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago. \$10.

<sup>6</sup> T. Braasch, *Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur sog. Caedmonschen Genesis*, *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft 76, pp. vii + 157, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1933; R. E. Zachrisson, *An English Pronouncing Dictionary and Spelling-List in Anglic*, pp. xxiii + 90, Uppsala, 1933.

<sup>7</sup> E. Partridge, *Words, Words, Words*, pp. x + 230. Methuen, London 1933, 6s.; *Slang To-day and Yesterday*, pp. ix + 476. Macmillan, New York, 1934. \$5.

*Whit(t)aker*," from a phonetic point of view at least. The adverbial use of adjectives like *bloody* and *jolly* (p. 81) did not involve the dropping of a suffixal *-ly*. *Cage*, p. 144, is used in America for a kind of gymnasium; the term seems to have been baseball slang to start with. Mr. Partridge's second volume is divided into five parts: General Considerations (pp. 1-36), a Sketch of the History of English Slang (pp. 37-128), Particular Aspects (pp. 129-294, American Slang (pp. 295-348) and Vocabularies (pp. 349-468); an index of eight pages concludes the book, which is meant for popular reading and has little value for the scholar. It is odd to find Ford Madox Ford made into an American (p. 309).

Mr. Carr has done a careful piece of work on German words in English.<sup>8</sup> I have the following comments to make on certain items. *Bargh* 1693 from *G berg* (p. 45) is a beautiful example of sound-substitution; it indicates the value [æ] for English *a* of that date. Weekley's *dauten* is perhaps a misprint for *däuten*, a variant spelling of *deuten*; the derivation of *deus*(*ing-rod*) from *deuten* makes difficulties because of the *t* of the latter word, but the sound-shift *t* > *s* is characteristic of Cornish. The loss of *r* in *veneer* (p. 52) from *G fournier* calls for explanation; likewise the initial *v*. Alongside *seminar* 1889 (p. 80) should be noted *seminary*, which occurs even earlier. I find it in the Johns Hopkins Univ. Circular for Jan., 1880, p. 11. *Philology* (p. 83) is unhappily used in the sense 'linguistics.' To the list of Americanisms on p. 88 should be added *dumb* 'stupid' (see *NED*. Suppl.). *Pretzel* (p. 88) is hardly 'a crisp biscuit.'

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Loewe have given us useful studies of exotic words in English and other European languages.<sup>9</sup> Mr. Taylor sticks to Arabic, while Mr. Loewe goes into Peruvian, Brazilian, West-Indian and Guianic, Mexican and Central American, North-American, African and Malay. Mr. Taylor adds an instructive section in which he compares the linguistic effects of the Moslem conquest of Spain and the Norman conquest of England. Mr. Lyttelton's treatise is of a different kind.<sup>10</sup> Though issued by a learned society, it upholds the hoary thesis (illustrated by sundry cases of semantic change and the like) that the English language stands

<sup>8</sup> C. T. Carr, *The German Influence on the English Vocabulary*, S.P.E. Tract, No. XLII, pp. 35-95. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1934. \$1.25.

<sup>9</sup> W. Taylor, *Arabic Words in English*, S.P.E. Tract, No. xxxviii, pp. 567-99, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1933; R. Loewe, *Über einige europäische Wörter exotischer Herkunft*, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, LX, 145-84 and LXI, 37-136. Göttingen, 1933.

<sup>10</sup> The Rev. the Hon. Edward Lyttelton, *The Claim of our Mother Tongue*. The English Association, Pamphlet 87, pp. 12. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1934. \$.80.



in peril, and that "we educated folk" have a duty towards it: "that is, to preserve it; to prevent it from being spoilt." Unluckily the author says nothing about the duty of learning the facts of linguistic history before passing judgment, and the state of his own knowledge of these facts comes out when he tells us that *reliable* is an Americanism (according to the *NED.* its use in our language goes back to 1569). He also corrects to *at* the *to* of *I have been to Brighton* (p. 9). I will conclude my notice of this pamphlet by quoting the following literary judgment (p. 11): "Would that the writings of that most gifted scholar and divine, Dean Church, were not sinking into oblivion. Next to Newman he was perhaps our greatest prose writer."

Mr. Krebs and Mr. Feist have studied with success, the former one word, the latter five word-groups in the Middle-English vocabulary.<sup>11</sup> Mr. Krebs begins with OE *clerc* 'cleric' and traces its semantic development in ME times. He distinguishes four meanings: (1) member of the clergy, (2) man of learning, (3) functionary or official, and (4) holder of the right to "benefit of clergy." He links this semantic development with the changes in the civilization of the period; in particular, with the spread of education to the laity and the secularizing effects of the Church's educational activities. While the author's materials and conclusions have no great novelty, he has done well to bring them together in an orderly monograph useful for reference. Mr. Feist takes up five aspects of French influence on medieval England (the Church, the law, taxation, the military and social life), and under each aspect considers a limited group of words, the history of which in French and English he traces in terms of the activities which they serve to name. The method is not new, but in the past it has been applied somewhat loosely and uncritically. Mr. Feist's treatment of his materials is marked by a greater degree of rigor, and his conclusions are therefore more nearly exact than those reached by his predecessors in the field. The general introductory observations on English history are less valuable; the author would have profited by a reading of R. W. Chambers' *Continuity of English Prose*. From the list of native names still in use (p. 10), ostensibly complete, many names are omitted, as *Alfred, Alvin, Audrey, Baldwin, Cuthbert, Edwin, Elbert, Elmer, Ethel*, etc., etc.

The two most recent volumes of the English Place-Name Society

<sup>11</sup> K. Krebs, *Der Bedeutungswandel von ME. Clerk und damit zusammenhängende Probleme*, Bonner Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, Heft XXI, pp. 162. Bonn, 1933; R. Feist, *Studien zur Rezeption des französischen Wortschatzes im Mittelenglischen*, [Försters] Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, Heft xxv, pp. xiv + 87, Leipzig, 1934.

uphold the high standards of the series.<sup>12</sup> The following comments may be of some use in certain matters of detail. Vol. of 1933 (vol. x of series): p. 9 *Egelweardesle*: derivation from *Æpelweard* rather than *Ægelweard* seems a conclusion contrary to the evidence; p. 16 *Catesby*: the genitival *s* is better explained as due to an alternative strong inflexion of the personal name; p. 39 *Blakesley*: rather 'clearing frequented by a black wolf'; p. 44, line 12: for 58 read 59; p. 53 *Farthinghoe*: the *th* (from *n*) may be due to dissimilation; p. 56 *Radstone*: the first element may be OE *rād* and if so the name means 'riding stone' (the *u* spellings are explicable as scribal misreadings of *a*, which in the Insular hand looks much like *u*); p. 58 *Stuchbury* and p. 92 *Pattishall*: for the phonology compare *etch*; p. 68 *Creaton*: perhaps the first element is a metathetic form of OE *ceart* 'wild common land'; p. 73 *Dow Bridge*: from the spellings the *v* would seem to have been vocalized, not lost; p. 77 *Winwick*: the first element seems to have been in the gen. pl. (not sg.) and the name means 'dairy-farm of the friends'; p. 87 *Rounsthorp*: this spelling exemplifies a disputed stage (cf. *MPh.*, xx, 189 ff.) in the history of the *au*-diphthong; p. 90 *Gauton*: this need not be a mistake for *Ganton*; p. 92 *Derlewescote*: here *-lew* hardly answers to OE *lāf* and the first element perhaps goes back to an OE *dēorhlēo* 'bold (or beloved) protector,' an epithet applied to the owner, whose true name was *Dēorstān*; p. 109 *Arthingworth*: see *Farthinghoe* above; p. 121 *Seleby*: the first element looks like an old locative sg.; p. 132 *Bethlinges*: this form is derivable from OE *bytlung* 'building' and the name means simply 'the buildings'; p. 134 *Overstone*: the *rs* is an inverted spelling, made possible by the phonetic loss of *r* before *s*; p. 139 *Snewelle*: perhaps rather an error for *Senwelle*; p. 185 *Wigsthorpe*: the first element is rather OE *Wicing*; p. 192 *Irnecestre*: this form of the first element indicates that we have to do with a gen. pl.; p. 215 *Pakebrok*: this seems to be an early example of the unrounding of short *u*; p. 220 *Strapton*: this is an interesting case of metathesis, the *t* and *st* of *Trapston* having changed places (a parallel is *Stilton* < *Tilston* NRY.; see further *Aph. Scand.*, vi, 330); p. 230 *Beornican*: for the *-i* see *Jespersen Misc.* (1930), p. 50. Vol. of 1934 (Vol. xi of series): p. 15 *Roydens* and pp. 97 f. *Roydens*, *Roydon* show the same sound-change as that in *boil* < OE *bȳl*; p. 41 *Carshalton*: the sound-change *rs* > *rsh* is familiar in German but rare in English; p. 47 *Croydon*: for the

<sup>12</sup> J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Northamptonshire*, pp. lii + 311; the same, in collaboration with Arthur Bonner, *The Place-Names of Surrey*, pp. xlvii + 445. Macmillan, New York, 1933-4.

vocalization of *g* to *i* compare *broiden* beside *browden*; p. 66 *scēan*, *scēane*: these hypothetical non-WS forms are hardly sound reconstructions, since one would expect rather *scēn*, *scēne*; p. 70 *Tadworth*: the initial *t* is best explained as a case of dissimilation (arising in combinations with *South* and *North*); p. 78 *Leatherhead*: I connect this name with OE *lēodræden* 'district, region' (on the *i* of *Leodridan* see *Jespersen Misc.*, p. 50); p. 87 *Cobham*: the first element *coven* evidently came to be pronounced *cobm* (compare colloquial *sebm* for *seven*), whence, with loss of the nasal, the form now current; p. 158 *Pray*: perhaps connected with OE *preg* (see *Holthausen s. v.*); p. 187 *Burifold*: this name seems to mean 'cattle-pen of the borough' (cf. *Marden*, p. 318); p. 203 *Tolt*: perhaps from OE *tealt*, applied to a clump of trees waving in the wind (vocalism as in *olp* < *alp* 'bullfinch'); p. 234 *Dunsfold*: the forms are best explained on the presumption that the owner of the fold was named *Dunthere*, but was also known as *Dunt*, a short form of his name; p. 251 *Tenningshook*: this is not a "corrupt" form, arising as it did by the familiar phonetic process of assimilation; p. 276 *Islinghurst*: the variation in the initial vowel is due to the existence, side by side, of mutated and unmutated forms, as in OE *Wulfingas* beside *Wylfingas*; p. 284 *Snora*: much earlier examples of *o* from OE *ā* are on record, as *sole* in *Beowulf* 302; p. 312 *pre-English*: for this unhappy term (properly applied only to the Germanic dialect from which English sprang) *non-English* should be substituted; p. 319 *Norbryght*: this name shows the interesting sound-change [ǫv > ǫb], a change which exemplifies the English tendency (illustrated also in *Tadworth* above) to stop the second of two consecutive spirants; the forms with initial *l* owe this sound to a prefixing of the French article; in many of the forms the first *r* has been lost by dissimilation; the second 1273 form shows the sound-change [ǫ > v]; p. 323 *Lyuenesfeld*: this is a beautiful example of the sound-change [m > v]; p. 327 *Lingfield*: I connect the first element with the name of the second king of the Langobards. In our oldest source, the *Origo Gentis Langobardorum*, this name appears in the alternative forms *Laiamicho* [lājamigo] and *Lamicho* [lāmigo]. The second form is derivable from the first, by loss of intervocalic [j] and subsequent contraction. To *Laiamicho* answers pre-English trisyllabic \**Lāimikō* > \**Laimikō*, whence, with phonetically regular smoothing,umlaut, syncope and place-assimilation, the extant *Lāenca*. To *Lamicho* answers a pre-English uncontracted \**Lāamkō* (with nil-grade of the *k*-suffix), whence prim. Engl. \**Lāomca* and OE \**Lāanca*. The extant *Lēanga* is derivable from \**Lāanca* by loss of the hypocoristic *k*-suffix (as in the Scandinavian form; see *AJPh.*, XLVII, 341 f.);

the Englishman who first analysed \**Lēanca* into true name plus hypocoristic suffix would necessarily abstract the true name as \**Lēang* (strong) or *Lēanga* (weak) because of the velar *n* present in \**Lēanca* (of the historical derivation of this *n* from *m* he could have known nothing). I am printing elsewhere a fuller discussion of this etymology.

The activities of the English Place-Name Society have aroused new interest in this country in the study of our own place-names. Professor Ramsay of the University of Missouri has been particularly active in promoting such work, and now, in conjunction with Mr. Read and Miss Leech, he issues what he describes as "an interim report of the study of Missouri place-names which has been carried on by students in the English department of the Graduate School of the University of Missouri for the past six years."<sup>13</sup> The volume consists of (1) Plans for the Study of Missouri Place-Names, by Mr. Ramsay, (2) a Bibliography of Written Sources for the Study of the Place-Names of Missouri, by Mr. Read, and (3) The Place-Names of Pike County, Missouri, by Miss Leech. From the Preface (written by Mr. Ramsay) we learn that the survey has made good progress. Of the 114 counties, 60 have already been studied, and studies of the remainder are under way or in prospect. One can only congratulate Mr. Ramsay and his fellows, and hope that place-name students in other States of the Union will be moved to emulation.

Miss Peitz, Mr. Göhler and Mr. Langenfelt deal variously with various aspects of medieval English.<sup>14</sup> Miss Peitz seeks to prove a definite thesis: "... die normalisierte Hochsprache ... ist nicht aus einem oder mehreren Dialekten erwachsen, sondern steht über den Mundarten. Trotzdem bedient sie sich naturgemäss der Mittel der Mundart ... und zwar erscheint in der neuen Hochsprache der Lautstand des östlichen Mittellandes und die Flexion des nördlichen Dialektes" (p. 14). The formula is too neat, too much simplified, to win conviction, in the absence of an overwhelming body of evidence. We have reason to think that standard English speech was the product of many interacting influences, a complex not capable of analysis in terms so clean-cut. Moreover, the

<sup>13</sup> R. L. Ramsay, A. W. Read and E. G. Leech, *Introduction to a Survey of Missouri Place-Names*, Univ. of Missouri Studies, ix, No. 1, pp. 124. Columbia, Mo., 1934. \$1.25.

<sup>14</sup> A. Peitz, *Der Einfluss des nördlichen Dialektes im Mittelenglischen auf die entstehende Hochsprache*, Bonner Studien zur engl. Philologie, Heft xx, pp. 133, Bonn, 1933; T. Göhler, *Lautlehre der ae. Hexameron-Homilie des Abtes Ælfric*, pp. 182, Weida i. Thür., 1933; G. Langenfelt, *Select Studies in Colloquial English of the Late Middle Ages*, pp. xxvii + 129. Lund, 1933.

author makes a number of specific statements hardly borne out by the facts. Thus, she tells us (p. 15) that the great Scandinavian settlements in England were in the northeast midlands, not north of the Humber, and thereby denies the existence of the very considerable settlement in Yorkshire. Again, we read (p. 71) of the London dialect in the 14th century: "Anlautendes hw ist wh geschrieben, ist also stimmhaft geworden: who, whom." Such inaccuracies shake our faith in the soundness of the author's methods and in the validity of her results. The monograph is however not without value in laying stress on the northern contribution to standard English. Mr. Göhler has made a careful, accurate investigation of the phonology of a single OE monument, following closely the rubrics of Luick's *Grammatik*. He has found little that was not known before, but, in his own words (p. 25), he has "nicht nur früher Gefundenes durch neue Beispiele erhärtet, sondern mit Hilfe der modernen Grammatik auch manches Unsichere geklärt und blossе Vermutungen bestätigt." The book will prove useful to future grammarians. Mr. Langenfelt's volume exhibits the characteristics already familiar in his other writings: it is full of ideas and illuminating quotations, pleasant reading, stimulating, but not orderly, not closely reasoned, suggestive rather than convincing. The present work by its title disclaims unity and disarms criticism. I cannot forbear, however, quoting and commenting on one statement of the author's. In speaking of the effects of the Norman Conquest on the English language, he says (p. 4), "English, cut away from any use in cultural matters—except for clerical and chronicling purposes—then dwindled down to mere insignificance." The author's low estimate of the importance of religious literature in the Middle Ages is so completely at variance with the facts that the falsity of his conclusion becomes evident without further words. Such fallacious judgments are found too often in this and other works of Mr. Langenfelt. And yet I have read the *Select Studies* with profit, and can warmly commend the book to all who are willing to overlook the bad for the sake of the good.

Mr. Matthes has got out a second edition of the lamented R. Jordan's volume on Middle-English phonology.<sup>15</sup> The changes in the text itself amount to little more than corrections of misprints, clarifications of references and the like. The editor has added 15 pages of *Nachträge* which serve to bring the volume up to date, and the author's brother has given us a welcome sketch of R. Jor-

<sup>15</sup> R. Jordan, *Handbuch der me. Grammatik, I. Teil: Lautlehre*. Zweite durchgesehene Auflage, bearbeitet von Dr. H. Chr. Matthes. Pp. xiv + 294. Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1934. RM 6.65.

dan's life (pp. 291-4). I note that Mr. Matthes, though he cites Miss Allen's monograph on Rolle (p. 281), does not correct Jordan's ascription of the *Prick* to Rolle (p. 13). In other words, we have no true revision of the handbook, but only the materials for a revision. Miss Davies has edited a number of extracts from English documents illustrative of English pronunciation between 1428 and 1730.<sup>16</sup> To the texts she has prefixed an 18-page survey of the sound-changes characteristic of the period, and she has added a 15-page index of significant spellings. The book is designed to give to students of early Modern English a group of texts exhibiting the sound-changes dogmatically set down in the current handbooks; by working through these texts the student comes into direct contact with the evidence upon which the statements of the grammarians are based. The idea is a happy one, and the little volume will serve a useful purpose. Sundry details in the introductory matter are open to question; thus, *wike* 'week' (p. 5) is a dubious illustration of the raising of the ME close *e*. Mrs. Varney has made a study of the pronunciation of the sound [ɪ] in the mouths of 10 American subjects;<sup>17</sup> in her study she relied chiefly on instruments of precision but likewise recorded the evidence of her own eyes and ears. The investigation establishes the existence of three kinds of [ɪ] in the speech of the subjects and hence, presumably, in American speech generally, since the subjects seem to be representative enough: (1) a "clear" or "explosive" sound in initial position or in an initial group; (2) an "obscure" or "implosive" sound in final position or in a final group; (3) an intermediate sound in intervocalic position. All three of these sounds are more or less nasalized, though the degree of nasalization varies a good deal with the subject. The author had much trouble in determining the syllabic boundary in words with intervocalic [ɪ]; the truth is, I think, that the [ɪ] itself constitutes the boundary, and it only confuses matters to distinguish an intervocalic [ɪ] as "initial" or "final." The monograph is marred by a number of misprints, as "Standford" University (p. 9).

Recent activity has been considerable in the study of the OE subjunctive. Mr. Callaway now adds to his previous investigation of the temporal subjunctive a monograph on the consecutive subjunctive, and Mr. Behre contributes a comprehensive treatise on the subjunctive in the poetical texts.<sup>18</sup> Mr. Callaway's work is marked,

<sup>16</sup> C. Davies, *English Pronunciation from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century, A Handbook to the Study of Historical Grammar*, pp. xvi + 167. Dent, London, 1934. 6s.

<sup>17</sup> J. M. Varney, *Études sur l'ɪ américain*, p. 185. Paris, 1933.

<sup>18</sup> M. Callaway, *The Consecutive Subjunctive in Old English*, MLAA.

as usual, by thoroughness and urbanity. He bases his findings on a compilation of all cases of the construction in the chief monuments, and where (as in translations) Latin influence was or might have been a factor he has systematically compared the Latin originals with the OE texts. He has limited his investigations to the so-called pure consecutive sentences, i. e. those in which the idea of result is indicated by an introductory particle. He concludes that the consecutive subjunctive is a native idiom, though it underwent a certain extension through the influence of Latin, and that "the contingent nature of the result expressed" was the chief factor in the choice of a subjunctive (rather than indicative) construction. These conclusions will hardly be shaken by future research. Mr. Behre tells us that the object of his treatise is "to describe and explain the uses and functions of the subjunctive as occurring in OE poetry and, on the basis of the OE poetical material, to set forth the factors determining the subjunctive usage in the OE language in general" (p. 1). In so doing, he distinguishes between the volitional subjunctive (subdivided into hortative, optative, preceptive and concessive) on the one hand, and the subjunctive of conditionality (subdivided into *irrealis* and *potentialis*) on the other; in subordinate clauses he takes account of yet another kind of subjunctive, called the meditative and interpreted as a variety of the subjunctive of conditionality. The subjunctives of subordinate clauses, however, are taken up according to the function (noun, adjective or adverb) of the clause in the sentence, except for indirect questions, which are given a chapter of their own. The terms *volitional* and *conditionality* are not altogether happy, since volition in English is will and can hardly be stretched to include mere wish, while conditionality brings to mind *if*-clauses and the like. Moreover, if two main kinds of subjunctives are to be distinguished, the historical distinction between conjunctive and optative is surely the one to be kept. I should prefer a psychological rather than historical division of the OE subjunctive into animative (feeling), putative (opinion), morative (moral judgment), judicative (rational judgment) and volitive (will); see my discussion in *The Manly Anniversary Studies* (1923), pp. 377 ff. Among the subdivisions of the animative are the optative and the concessive (misleading term!); the latter expresses, of course, the feeling of indifference. The putative answers, in part, to the meditative of Mr. Behre; its use stamps the statement as a conjecture, opinion or belief, whether

of the speaker or of somebody else. The morative expresses judgments of duty, propriety or justice, and therefore includes within its scope Mr. Behre's preceptive. The judicative expresses judgments of degree of ideal likelihood: possibility, probability and certainty. It thus corresponds to Mr. Behre's subjunctive of conditionality. Mr. Behre distinguishes not three but two aspects of this subjunctive: *irrealis* and *potentialis*. But the former is only a judicative contrary to fact (usually though not always a judgment of ideal certainty), while the latter is a judicative of the lowest degree (possibility). From the foregoing it will be plain that I cannot follow Mr. Behre in his analysis of the OE subjunctive; in spite of this disagreement, however, I have greatly profited by my reading of his monograph, which deserves careful study on the part of every student of OE poetry.

Mr. Robertson has written an interesting and valuable history of the English language.<sup>19</sup> The following comments on various matters of detail may prove of use when a second edition is called for. P. 19: *satem* is not a Sanskrit word. P. 23: the forms listed as Celtic seem actually to be Irish. P. 29, last word: read *spirants*. P. 30: here and elsewhere (as p. 195 and notably p. 170) the author distinguishes stops from straits, not by the want of an aperture in the one case and its presence in the other, but on the theory that the stop is momentary while the strait is continuous; in using for straits the term *continuant* he upholds this hoary heresy, in spite of his disclaimer (footnote, p. 170). If *strait* as a name for sounds with *hemmung* does not strike his fancy, the French *constrictive* is available; this term, like *strait*, includes liquids and nasals. P. 40: here the author states that the terms *Old English* and *Anglo-Saxon* "should mean precisely the same thing," but the actual difference in their meaning cannot be dismissed with a "should" (see *RES.*, v, 179 ff.); I disagree with the author on the point, believing as I do that this distinction serves a useful purpose and enriches our language. Worthy of note in this connexion (though beside the point) is the author's use of *Anglo-Saxon* on p. 59 in a sense which *Old English* cannot have. P. 43: the author fails to mention the flight of many Britons across the English Channel to what is now Brittany. P. 52, note 15: *clerk*, *false* and *turn* are not French borrowings in OE; see Luick, *Gram.*, p. 69. P. 54: *earl* in its modern form and sense is a Scandinavian loan-word. P. 56: the author is wrong in saying that "in the history of neither German nor Dutch had the Renaissance impulse . . . been pre-

<sup>19</sup> S. Robertson, *The Development of Modern English*, pp. ix + 559. Prentice-Hall, New York, 1934.



ceded by an earlier wholesale borrowing of French words." P. 57: in OE words like *lār* the *-e* of the oblique cases began to be extended to the nom. as early as the tenth century. P. 58: most French words taken into ME simply replaced native words and such a replacement cannot properly be described as making "the word-stock richer and fuller." P. 60: not the *Chronicle* but devotional pieces like the *Ancren Riwe* represent the continuity of our literary tradition; the author might well have cited to the point R. W. Chambers' little masterpiece, *The Continuity of English Prose*. P. 106: Dutch has been greatly exposed to foreign influence, and Swedish was much affected by German and Latin at least. P. 110: I am sceptical of the strength if not of the existence in the Middle Ages of "the conservative checks that usually operate to throttle popular tendencies in language." Normans or no, changes in popular speech could hardly have been retarded, much less throttled, by a literary standard (essentially orthographical rather than oral) promoted and upheld by a clerical group always small and often reduced to a mere handful. P. 126: *she* developed phonetically from OE *heo*, not *seo*; see M. B. Ruud, *MLN.*, xxxv, 222. P. 141: *dove* is a modern analogical form which is replacing the older *dived* rather than the reverse. P. 170: stoppage need not be, and often is not, terminated by an explosion. P. 179: the Southern pronunciation of *board* here recorded is wrong; on p. 229 the vocalism is correctly given. P. 195: words like *honest* had mute, not weak *h* in French. P. 196: words like *patience* never had a *t*-pronunciation in English. P. 197: *sh* is an OE sound, though in those days it was spelt *sc*. P. 200: I am sceptical of the voiceless *th* of ME *the* and *they*. P. 207: there is nothing odd about the development of OE *æ* in Middle and Modern English; see *MPh.*, xxiii, 483. P. 217: the Northern Englishman uses neither [æ] nor [a] in *laugh*. P. 222: on intonation in America and Britain, see my paper in *SPh.*, xxiii, 371 ff. P. 228: the author omits perhaps the most striking characteristic of New England speech, the short vowel in words like *whole*. P. 232: mention might here be made of the neutral vowel in the American pronunciation of *record* sb., as contrasted with the full vowel in British speech. P. 335: *paradise* is not from Old French (though *parvis* is); French *paradis* and English *Paradise* are learned words taken directly from Latin. The same applies to *magic*. P. 339: on *spook* see *Place-Names of Surrey*, p. 272. P. 370: on the supposed fem. suffix *-ster* see *MLR.*, xxii, 131 ff. P. 372: the type *coldish* 'somewhat cold' wants mention. P. 481, line 10: *boarding* read *hoarding*.

In 1929 the lamented S. A. Leonard published his *Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800*, a study of prescriptive grammar (an apt term of Jespersen's) as it took form in eighteenth-century England. His successor, Mr. Pooley, now brings out a like study of prescriptive grammar in nineteenth-century America.<sup>20</sup> He has gone through 16 handbooks of grammar and composition widely used in this country, and finds the old prescriptions still dominant in these handbooks, in spite of the rise of scientific research in this field of knowledge, research based on objective and systematic examination of the actual linguistic phenomena pertinent to the subject. Mr. Pooley's findings, depressing though they are, can hardly be called in question. The evidence is overwhelming that our writers of schoolbooks, by and large, either are ignorant of the scientific work which for many years has been going on in the grammatical field, or (what is perhaps even worse) deliberately ignore the scientific conclusions which have been reached through such work. The author makes slips now and then, of course, and it may be worth while to mention a few of these: p. 11: the term *liberalist* is not wholly satisfactory as a name for the opponents of the purists, since it is not so much a matter of liberality as of the *scientific* (as against the dogmatic) approach to linguistic questions; pp. 12 and 166: Professor J. M. Manly's name is consistently misspelt; p. 14: one of the handbooks belongs to the last year of the nineteenth century; the others belong to the second and third decades of the present century; the distinction drawn between grammar, syntax and usage (see also pp. 52 and 65) has the effect of identifying grammar with morphology, a departure from popular and technical usage alike; p. 38 footnote: for *philology* read *etymology*; p. 49: I cannot accept the biological analogy which makes of language "a living, growing organism"; p. 69: the first quotation from *Beowulf* is wrongly interpreted; p. 134: I am somewhat sceptical of the notion that *like* as a conjunction is less common on the east coast of this country.

Mr. Jespersen has got out a one-volume modern English grammar, written for use in the class-room; with it he has issued a pamphlet in which he discusses various controversial matters that could not be taken up in the needed detail in a handbook.<sup>21</sup> The author's grammatical system is already well known, and calls for

<sup>20</sup> R. C. Pooley, *Grammar and Usage in Textbooks on English*, University of Wisconsin Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin, No. 14, August, 1933, pp. 172. Madison, Wis.

<sup>21</sup> O. Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar*, pp. 387. Holt, New York, 1933; *The System of Grammar*, pp. 46. Allen & Unwin, London, 1933.

no further discussion here. Be it enough to say that I have used the *Essentials* to my entire satisfaction in the class-room, and look upon it as the best one-volume grammar on the market today; if teacher and class differ with the author now and then, that only adds to the interest of the meetings and the liveliness of the discussions. Mrs. Aiken has likewise brought out a grammar, seemingly designed for elementary classes.<sup>22</sup> The book is marked, as one would expect, by freshness and independence of outlook, to which time and much thought have added a ripeness not characteristic of the author's earlier work. Here however we have, not a piece of original research but rather its results, and these results are given with a brevity reminiscent of the handbooks of Henry Sweet. The author must accordingly be prepared to find her many innovations met with a shake of the head; it is to be hoped that she will back them up with a series of exhaustive articles or monographs aimed at the learned public rather than the schoolbook market. Let me illustrate. The author denies (p. 14) to the command *come here* the status of a sentence "since the subject is lacking," though she admits that *come here* is "a complete communication." Later on (p. 48) she tells us, "there are two tests by which a verb may be recognized, and every verb must fulfil both of them if it is to be analyzed as performing this function at all. The verb must express action or assertion, and it must have a subject, a complement, or both." It would seem, then, that the author does not look upon the imperative *come* as a verb, but rather (one must suppose) as an interjection, or perhaps as in a class all its own, that of words of command. This is of course a radical departure from orthodox grammar, and such a departure calls for detailed justification, but we get nothing of the kind, and indeed could hardly expect much exposition or argument in an elementary handbook. Stimulating therefore as Mrs. Aiken's grammar is, it will hardly get the attention which it may well deserve until its novelties are better fortified.

Of the monographs and dissertations published by the *Linguistic Society of America* during the period under review, those of Messrs. Buchanan, Jenkins, Rosen, Goetsch and Rettger come within the province of this journal.<sup>23</sup> Mr. Buchanan's (Cornell) dissertation

<sup>22</sup> J. R. Aiken, *A New Plan of English Grammar*, pp. viii + 216. Holt, New York, 1933. \$1.40.

<sup>23</sup> C. D. Buchanan, *Substantivized Adjectives in Old Norse*, pp. 62, 1933; T. A. Jenkins, *Word-Studies in French and English*, pp. 94, 1933; H. Rosen, *OHG Prepositional Compounds in Relation to their Latin Originals*, pp. 91, 1934; C. Goetsch, *Phonology of the Low German Deeds in the Oldest Registry at Riga, Latvia*, pp. 59, 1934; J. F. Rettger, *Development of Ablaut in the Strong Verbs of the East Midland Dialects of Middle English*, pp. 186, 1934.

gives "as complete a list as possible of the substantivized adjectives in ON," together with relevant material from the other Gmc dialects, and, occasionally, from other IE languages as well. Present participles which became nouns were excluded from the investigation. The examples listed are classified under the three heads Living Beings, Inanimate Things and Abstract Nouns. Each noun listed is defined, the corresponding adjective is regularly given, and when needful there is a short etymological discussion (without benefit of Walde-Pokorny). More material might well have been brought to bear (thus, under *baldr* one looks in vain for OE *bealdor*), but in general the author has done the workmanlike job one would expect of a student of A. L. Andrews. The *Studies* of the lamented Jenkins leave us regretful that we cannot have a succession of volumes like the present one, which is made up of 20 etymologies, characterized by the author thus: "I believe them all to be new, and I believe them all to be sound." It should be added that most of the etymologies in the volume are new only in that they originated with the author, who had printed most of them previously in various learned publications. Here however they are brought out together and in somewhat revised form, the author having read, not without profit, the criticisms of his colleagues. I will comment on one etymology only, that of English *gun*, which the author plausibly derives from a Walloon (*en*)*gon(s)*, but the vocalism of which is not easy to explain without drawing upon Skeat's *Domina Gunilda*, the name actually given to a mangonel circa 1330. I suggest that *gun* owes its phonetic pattern and its meaning to the French word, but its *u* (instead of *o*) to contamination with the proper name. Mr. Rosen in his (Pennsylvania) dissertation has studied the prefixes in the OHG Gospel Harmony of Tatian, comparing them with the corresponding prefixes (if any) in the Latin original, with a view to determining to what extent the OHG prepositional compounds used by the translator reflect a slavish or mechanical part-by-part translation from Latin into German. He concludes that in the text under investigation "there are 670 clear instances of mechanical part-by-part correspondence. . . . As there are 3,075 occurrences of such compounds in the Latin text, the percentage of instances of part-by-part relationship . . . is 21.8." A further group, in which the correspondence is not so clear, accounts for 12.1 per cent. of the total. The remaining instances, 66.1 per cent. of the total, do not exhibit part-by-part correspondence. It seems clear that this particular translation, at least, was no slavish following of the Latin, even if one makes the unwarranted assumption that the part-by-part correspondence,

wherever it occurs, was strictly mechanical translation. The author's technique seems sound and his results have some importance in estimating the linguistic capabilities of OHG and, by inference, of the other Old-Germanic dialects. Mr. Goetsch has investigated the phonology of the German parts of the so-called First Riga Deed Book, a register of real-estate transfers during the period from 1384 to 1482. The German entries in this book are nearly all of the fifteenth century. The investigation has proved beyond possibility of question that the Deed Book, in its German parts, is written in the North-Saxon dialect of MLG. It seems natural to infer that this dialect was the official language of Riga in the fifteenth century. Mr. Rettger's (Yale) dissertation is a useful study of the changes which took place in the ablaut-patterns of the strong verbs in the ME dialects of the east and central midlands. The author has gone through 19 texts written in these dialects, and (with specified exceptions) has listed all the occurrences of the verb-forms under investigation. The work is divided into two parts: Part I takes up the ablaut verbs which may be called regular, Part II those which show irregularities of one kind or another, together with the preterit-present verbs. The material is well arranged and intelligently discussed. Worthy of special note is the author's discussion of the *o* of the pret. pl. in classes II, III, IV and V.

Mr. Jespersen has brought together in a single volume a number of his papers first published separately: as pamphlets, as articles in learned journals, or as parts of larger wholes. The papers range in date from 1886 to 1933. Also included are a few papers hitherto unpublished.<sup>24</sup> It is good to have these writings of the old master made so readily accessible, and one reads with interest and profit even the earliest of them. The Philosophical Faculty of the (Charles) University of Prague, in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of its English seminary, has published a volume of English studies, dedicated to Professor Vilém Mathesius.<sup>25</sup> The volume is made up of four studies, two of which come within the scope of the present survey. Mr. O. Vočadlo has written an appreciative essay, with the rather formidable title *Anglo-Saxon Terminology*, on the learned and technical vocabulary of Old English. To quote a couple of typical passages: "The language of Wessex as it was developed by Alfred and his followers was certainly the most refined and cultured speech among all early Teutonic dialects. . . . In fact one can confidently claim that the Anglo-Saxon with its rich vocabulary, which conformed to a Latin

<sup>24</sup> O. Jespersen, *Linguistica, Selected Papers in English, French and German*, pp. 461. Levin & Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 1933.

<sup>25</sup> *Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University*, pp. 172. Prague, 1933.

pattern in the formation of native abstract words and was a fit tool even for the subtleties of philosophical and theological thought, was no doubt the only fully developed vernacular language in Europe: the only mediaeval language which at an early period developed a remarkable nomenclature of science, religion and philosophy out of its own resources. . . . The more one studies Anglo-Saxon prose the more one realizes to what degree of perfection it attained" (p. 62). The author also quotes with approval the following statement of the late Sir James Murray (p. 63): "In literary culture the Normans were about as far behind the people whom they conquered as the Romans were when they made themselves masters of Greece; and it was not till some two generations after the Conquest that learning and literature regained in England somewhat of the position which they had occupied two centuries earlier." That the Norman Conquest lowered the level of culture as a whole in England (not merely the level of literary culture) is a thesis recently upheld by Mr. R. W. Chambers in his *Continuity of English Prose*, and the soundness of his contention will hardly be denied by any authority on the period, surprising though it may be to the general. It is a pity that Mr. Vočadlo's essay is not to be had separately, for it deserves wide reading in the Anglo-Saxon world. Mr. J. Vachek has given us a monograph *Über die phonologische Interpretation der Diphthonge, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Englischen*; see further his paper "What is Phonology?" in *English Studies*, xv, 81-92. The author is an able representative of the so-called phonological school, and his monograph is full of acute observations, though it suffers from a certain confusion or lack of clarity in the use of the term *function* (see *English Studies*, xvi, 22).

I will conclude this survey by calling attention to two German monographs which use linguistics as an approach to the study of literary style and the interaction of form and matter, problems too often neglected in learned circles (perhaps because of their inherent difficulty).<sup>26</sup> The authors have gone conscientiously to work and the analyses and correlations which they have made will have their value for future workers in the field. And yet there remain depths to be plumbed, in Richard Rolle and Christina Rossetti alike, depths which, let us hope, the authors will essay in fuller and riper studies than these.

KEMP MALONE

<sup>26</sup> A. Olmes, *Sprache und Stil der englischen Mystik des Mittelalters, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Richard Rolle von Hampole*, pp. viii + 100. [Morsbachs] Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXVI. Max Niemeyer, Halle, 1933. RM 4.50; F. Dubschlag, *Die Sprachform der Lyrik Christina Rossettis*, pp. vi + 94. [Morsbachs] Studien etc., LXXVII. Max Niemeyer, Halle, 1933. RM 4.40.

## REVIEWS

*English Place-Name Puzzles*, Uppsala 1932, *English Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory*, Uppsala 1934; by R. E. ZACHRISSON.

The aim of these two papers, which are offprints from *Studia Neophilologica* v, pp. 1-69, and vi, pp. 25-89, is to investigate to what extent personal names occur as elements of place-names. It has generally been held that pers. ns play an important rôle in pl. ns. Skeat perhaps somewhat overestimated their importance, but some of his successors, as Wyld and Sedgefield, went a very great deal too far in assuming pers. ns. I may refer to my review of Wyld's *Place-Names of Lancashire* in *Anglia-Beiblatt* XXIII, pp. 177 ff. Latterly scholars have generally reckoned with pers. ns to a fairly great extent, but not gone to the same excess as Wyld did.

In the papers before us Professor Zachrisson tries to prove that even the limited extent to which the majority of pl. n. students reckon with pers. ns is excessive, that pers. ns are rare in, and on the whole restricted to, certain categories of names, esp. names with habitative second els as *hām, tūn, worþ*, being rarely combined with other els (what is sometimes referred to as the terminal test or theory), that short-names were far fewer than full-names and that the comparatively rare occurrence even of full-names in pl. ns indicates that short-names must be reckoned with only to a very small extent (the maximum allowed being 3 short-names to 10 full-names) and that consequently the majority of the pl. ns that have been held to contain short-names must be differently explained. In Anglian districts full-names are held to be far less common in pl. ns than in the Saxon ones; in these, consequently, short-names must be reckoned with to a still smaller extent. Professor Zachrisson's theory at present is that Engl pl. ns contain a great number of significant words, chiefly words with a topographical meaning, that have not been hitherto recognised and are in most cases unrecorded.

The first paper (PNP) deals with *ing*-names (uncompounded ones of the type dealt with in my *Place-Names in -ing*, and the compound *ing*-names dealt with by Dr. Karlström, in so far as they contain full-names), further briefly with pl. ns containing full-names in Sussex, Worcestershire and Suffolk. The first two counties have been dealt with by the *English Pl. N. Society* and the material collected in their publications is used. For Suffolk Z. relies on collections of his own, but the material is not given, merely some figures.

The second paper (EP) deals with pl. ns containing full-names

in the genitive form found in OE charters and draws conclusions from the material. Only a small part of the material is given.

In PNP a good deal of space is devoted to my Pl. Ns in *-ing* (the type Godalming, Reading, Sonning). For names of this kind I assumed derivation from pers. ns to a considerable extent. Z. comes to the conclusion that such derivation cannot be definitely proved for one single name, and in his opinion no names in *-ingas* are derived from pers. ns. The method he uses is to take up the names one by one. Mucking, he says, need not be derived from *Mucca*, but may be derived from OE *\*muc* 'mud' (Engl *muck* is generally held to be a Scand word). Harpingden (*Herbertinges* 1086 DB) may be derived from OE *herepæþ* or OE *Herne-berding* (OE *hyrne* + *bord*), whatever that may mean. Wittering may be derived from an OE *\*wiohter* 'bend,' Wymering from an OE *Wid-* or *Wipig-mere*. I need not go on. It is clear that anything can be proved with this method. It is easy to prove, for instance, that not one *ing*-name is derived from a topographical word. Avening, which I derived from a river-name Avon, may just as well mean 'Afa's people.' There is nothing to prove that the little stream at Avening was ever called Avon. Blything is on the river Blyth, but the river-name has not been found until late times, and river-names are often back-formations. Blything may mean 'blithe people.' Wymering need not be derived from *Wid-* or *Wipigmere*—indeed no early forms point to such a base—, but may be derived from a pers. n. *Wigmær* or *Winemær*. Ulting I explain as 'dwellers on the river Ult,' but there is not a scrap of evidence that a river name Ult was ever used in England. This is exactly Professor Zachrisson's method, and he doubtless disapproves of it when it is directed against himself.

In trying to explain a group of pl. ns like names in *-ing* the sound method is first to see what names can be simply and naturally explained from known elements. It is then obvious that Godalming (*æt Godelmingum* 880-5, *Godhelming* 1173 P), Harpingden (*Herbertinges* DB), Wymering (*Wimeringes* DB), Wittering (*Wittringes* 683), Beeding (*æt Beadingum* 880-5), Woking (*Wocchingas* 708-15) should be derived from the pers. ns *Godhelm*, *Herebeorht*, *Wigmær* or *Winemær*, *Bēada*, *Wocc*. Woolbeding should rather be derived from OE *Wulfbeald* (note *Welbedlinge* DB) than from *\*Wulfbæd*. On the other hand names such as Avening, Blything, Ulting are naturally derived from river-names, Nazeing from OE *næs* 'headland,' Horning from *horn* 'a bend' and so on. Two types of names have to be reckoned with, and in dealing with doubtful cases we have the choice between the two types. Further the English *-ing*-names would be contemporary with and belong to the same stage of society as Continental names in *-ing*. They should therefore show the same formative types as the latter. German names



such as Dietmaring, Lothringen, Sigmaringen, Sickingen can only be explained as derivatives of the pers. names *Diotmar*, *Lothar*, *Sigimar*, *Siggo*. This strongly supports the theory that many English names in *-ing* are derived from pers. names.

It is certainly remarkable that *ing*-names derived from full-names are few compared with those for which derivation from short-names has been assumed. But in all probability several derivatives from full-names should be added to those assumed by me. Thus I now derive Bittering Nf (*Britringa* DB) from *Brihthere*, Wing (*æt Weowungum* for *Weopungum* 1012, *Withunga* DB) from *Weohthūn* (this explains the regular *-ung-* in early forms). Brightling may well be from OE *Beorhthelmingas*. On the other hand the number of short-names should be reduced in other ways. I claim sometimes to make use of that right of reconsidering an opinion, of which Prof. Zachrisson avails himself to such a great extent. Epping is shown by forms unknown to me when I wrote my book to be OE *Yppingas* rather than *Eoppingas*. Sompting I have myself later derived from OE *sumpt* 'marsh.' Tring is shown by a form *Trehanger* 1265 Misc not to be a name in *-ing* at all. Several names, for which I could only give a tentative etymology or for which I gave two alternative explanations, will probably be found to be derived from topographical words.

Even so, derivatives from short-names will be found to be a good deal in excess of derivatives from full-names, and I see no objection to such a result. We here come to the question of the relations of short-names to full-names and other questions concerning the use of pers. ns to form pl. ns. Incidentally I remark here that for pl. ns generally I do not by any means reckon with a percentage of derivatives from pers. ns similar to that suggested for names in *-ing*. For names in *-ing* I suggest derivation from pers. ns in the greater number of cases. In my Pl. Ns of Lancashire the number of pl. ns held to contain pers. ns is very small indeed (something like 140 out of c 1600 English names). Pl. ns in *-ing*, in so far as they go back to OE names in *-ingas*, are not in their origin pl. ns at all. They are old folk-names, names of the inhabitants of places that later passed into pl. ns. For such names we are justified in reckoning with formative principles different from those of ordinary pl. ns.

Professor Zachrisson postulates that the OE personal nomenclature was on the whole unchanged during the whole OE period. In the later centuries full-names are more common than short-names, and he concludes that such was the case in the earliest period. He tries to substantiate this by certain statistics, which are by no means convincing. He has counted the number of full-names and short-names under the letter *S* in Searle and finds full-names double the number of short-names, but we are not told the principles according to which the calculation was made. He finds twice as many full-names as short-names in *Beowulf*, but the names

in *Beowulf* are obviously of no importance for the question. There are, so far as I know, only 5 certain English names in *Beowulf*, the short-names *Offa*, *þrýþ* and *Hemming*, the full-names *Eomer*, *Garmund*.

In reality there is no doubt but that the OE personal nomenclature changed a good deal in the course of the centuries, and that short-names were a good deal more common in the earliest centuries than later. This has been convincingly proved by Redin. If we want to form an opinion on the usage of the time 450-600 the chief source available is the earliest part of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. I know quite well that the statements of that source cannot be always taken literally, but there can be no doubt that it contains a good deal of genuine tradition. In the said source the following names are found:<sup>1</sup> *Hengest*, *Horsa*, *Æsc* (455), *Ælle*, *Cymen*, *Wlencing*, *Cissa* (477), *Port*, *Bieda*, *Mægla* (501), *Stuf* (514), *Ida* (547), *Ælle* (560), *Cupa*, *Cnebb* (568), *Ceol* (591), *Crida* (593), on the other hand *Cynric* (495), *Wihthgar* (514), *Oslaf* (568), *Cupwulf*, *Cupwine* (571 ff.), *Æþelric* (588), *Cwichealm* (593), *Ceolwulf* (597). *Ceawlin* (568), *Wipped* (465) are doubtful. Here are 17 short-names as against 8 full-names.

Another test that indicates that short-names strongly decreased in popularity in the course of the OE period, even a fairly early period, is the following. In the Durham *Liber Vitæ* short-names are much more numerous in the earlier portions of the lists than in the later. The *Liber Vitæ* was written in the form we now have it c 800. We may assume that the order in the lists is on the whole chronological, so that the first parts represent an earlier time than the last. We may perhaps assume that the lists roughly cover the period 650-800. In the list of priests (Sweet, OET, pp. 156-8) there are in the first 15 lines 29 persons with short-names, in the remaining 40 lines only 11. The list of clerics (OET, pp. 158-62) is much longer. In the first 21 lines are 47 persons with short-names, in the following 42 lines 50, and in the last 42 lines only 17.

Under these circumstances we are justified in the assumption that in the period of migration (c 450-600) short-names were far more frequently used than in the following centuries, even that short-names may quite well have been more numerous than full-names. Moreover, there is good reason to believe that in real life even people who had full-names were often called by short-names. Redin has collected no less than 18 certain cases in which a short-name and a full-name are recorded as denoting the same person, 11 of these being from the time before 800. Professor Stenton has adduced three more cases. A further important case is the following. The *Cille* mentioned BCS 29 and 101 (A. D. c 672, 699) is clearly identical with *Ceolswiþ* ib. 74 (A. D. 688). Obviously *Cille* could be used as a short-name of *Ceolswiþ*. A further interesting example is adduced by Fägarsten, *Pl. N. Dorset*. The *Ælffrith*

<sup>1</sup> For obvious reasons I omit the names found in genealogies.

(*Ælfrīðus*) who in 987 gave Affpuddle to Cerne Abbey, must also have been known as *Æffa*, and the manor, which before was known as *Pidele*, got the name *Affpuddle* in consequence. Taking into account the nature of the material, the number of cases of this kind known is remarkable, and we must conclude that shortening of full-names in every-day use must have been very common indeed. I do not hesitate to give it as my opinion that Professor Zachrisson's results as to the relative frequency of full-names and short-names in early OE times are erroneous.

EP pp. 68 ff. Z. adduces the relation between full-names and short-names in compounds with *gemære* 'boundary' as a proof of the rarity of short-names. In such combinations short-names are very rare indeed. Z. has evidently not seen that the combinations in question are not compounds, not place-names at all. *Æpelstanes gemære* means 'the boundary of the land belonging to *Æpelstan*.' The vast majority of these combinations belong to the 10th century, and they only show, what we knew before, that among the upper classes full-names were practically the only ones used in that century. The people referred to in the *gemære* combinations were the landed gentry of the period.

The conclusion that pl. ns with a derivative in *-ing* from a pers. n. are very rare in Anglian counties, is not well founded. For Saxon counties a great number of OE charters are available, and for this reason, and for this reason alone, we can prove that pl. ns of the type under discussion were fairly common in these counties. If we did not possess the OE forms, hardly any Saxon names of this kind would be what Prof. Zachrisson calls *perfectly safe* instances. The OE charter material for Anglian counties is very poor. For some counties we have no OE charters at all or only some preserved in untrustworthy late transcripts. It is evidently necessary to adduce material from later sources, if a comparison is to be possible. Z. has made a halfhearted attempt to examine post-Conquest material, but has found no perfectly safe instances. In EP he has at least found one, Addington Ches. (presumably for Adlington). In reality there are numerous *reasonably safe* examples of the type in question in Anglian counties. To the five examples of names found in OE sources and therefore perfectly safe, may be added first Tissington Derby, Adlington, Alkrington Lanes, Edlington, Lissington Lincs, Eardington, Wilmington Salop, Almington Staffs, Kilvington Notts, Oughtrington, Tytherington Ches, Kilvington Yorks (NR), Drighlington, Edlington, Ouston (olim *Wolsington* etc.) Yorks (WR), Woollington Nb and many others. Alwalton Hunts is OE *Æpelwoldingtun*, later always *Adelwalton* and the like. It is pretty obvious that Kimbolton Hunts (*Chenebaltone DB*) is from *Cynebaldingtūn*, and that many pl. ns that apparently have an uninflected pers. n. as first el. in reality contain a derivative in *-ing*, e.g. Alkmonton Derby, Wyberton Lincs,

Albrighton, Kemberton, Tibberton, Woofferton Salop, Wilbrighton Staffs and numerous others. These are all names in *-tūn*. If the names with other elements were added, the list would become much longer. Clearly the type in question was as common in Anglian as in Saxon counties.

As Professor Zachrisson practically rules out short-names as elements of pl. ns, he has to find some other explanation of names that have been hitherto supposed to contain such. In the majority of cases he explains these elements as common nouns, usually with a topographical meaning. A great many pl. ns, in his opinion, contain hitherto unknown OE words meaning 'hill,' 'marsh' etc. So far as these hypothetical words occur in OE sources they generally have the unfortunate habit of appearing exclusively as the first el. of names and in the genitive form or else as the base of derivatives, which facts have caused them to be mistaken for pers. ns. For while pers. ns regularly appear in the gen. form, this is very rarely the case with common nouns, except under special circumstances, and known topographical words generally appear both as the first and as the second el. of pl. ns. The new elements discovered, moreover, are in the majority of instances unknown outside some pl. ns, not being recorded in any other English sources or in Continental languages. They generally have to be derived direct from some root, which has sometimes even to be invented for them.

Most of the new words so far discovered mean 'hill' or the like. Here is a list of some of the new words for 'hill,' 'hillside' or the like which we are called upon to add to the OE vocabulary: \**badde*, \**beaduc*, \**bate*, \**buc*, \**dūc*, \**dȳdel*, \**ēocer*, \**hlides(e)*, \**oc* (or \**ōc*), \**ocer*, \**hnoþ*, \**wroc*. Of words for 'fen' may be mentioned \**æffe*, \**god*, \**guter*, \**gyþe*, \**gyþel*. It is impossible here to discuss all these cases and indicate how the author has managed to get together this strange assortment of OE words. A few examples must suffice.

The word \**dūc* 'hill or hill-side' is derived from OE *dūcan* 'to dive' and is postulated solely to explain the pers. n. *Ducemann* (in *Ducemannestun*), which is held to mean 'man who lives on or near a hill or hill-slope,' and Norduck Bucks, of which no early forms are given, doubtless because none are known. It is suggested that \**dūc* is related to (identical with?) Swed *duk*, German *Tuch* 'table cloth,' which may, it is suggested, have meant 'something that hangs down.' Evidently Prof. Z. does not know that Swed *duk* is a loanword and that *Tuch*, OHG *tuoh* goes back to *dōk*. Comments are unnecessary. OE \**god*, \**gyþe* 'fen' are held to be related to OE *gēotan* etc., representing a side-root with IG *t*. OE \**god* is postulated on the strength of a few pl. ns such as Goddings, Godalming, \**gyþe* to account for OE *Gyprices wille* and the poor spelling *Gything* in an OE charter for *Gyting* (now Guiting), \**gyþel* on the strength of the pl. n. Givendale (*Gyðlingdale* c 1020). It is suggested that the new word \**god*

'fen' is found in Gotha (in Germany) and Norw Gudaaen, which latter is explained in *Norske elvenavne* as 'holy brook.' OE \**ēocer* 'hill' is taken to be related to OE *ēaca* 'increase' etc., representing a root-form *euk-*, not otherwise recorded in Germanic languages. It is assumed solely for Eggardon Hill in Dorset (*Glochresdone* 1084). But Eggardon doubtless contains the same first el. as Exbury Hants (*Ykeresbirie* 1196, *Ekeresbur* 1212, *Hukeresbir* 1235). Exbury is on flat land near the Solent. A more probable first el. of the names is OE \**Eohhere*, corresponding to OSwed *Joar*. *Eohhere*, it may be objected, is unrecorded, but so is \**ēocer*. Cognate with \**ēocer* are OE \**oc* and \**ocer*, held to be found in the river-name *Okement* and in OE *oce(r)burna*. OE \**æffe* 'fen' is assumed for Affpuddle, on which see *supra*, and Effingham, which, of course, means 'the hām of Æffa's people.' Æffa is a well evidenced pers. n.

Of the kind here indicated are the majority of Prof. Zachrisson's new contributions to place-name etymology. There are, no doubt, some suggestions that may be useful or at least worthy of serious discussion, but they are few. A good suggestion is that Coleshill contains an OE *coll* 'hill' corresponding to ON *kollr* etc. I had come to the same conclusion independently. But here we have a word evidenced in cognate languages, which may well have belonged to the English vocabulary too. Etymologies of this kind have often been suggested before by other scholars.

The two papers give rise to a good deal of criticism also in other respects. The method is often very loose, and there are numerous slips and inaccuracies. PNP p. 49, for instance, we are told that names in *-worth*, which are all very old and as a rule denote small, insignificant places, are not likely to contain pers. ns. In EP p. 47 this statement is evidently forgotten, and *worþ* is now one of the elements most often combined with pers. ns (10 OE cases, which might be added to). The first statement must have been made before the author had begun to study the question. PNP p. 30 we are told that names of the type *Swiðhelmingdænn* (*denn* 'swine-pasture' with a derivative in *-ing* from a pers. n. as first el.) were not likely to survive, and the author takes some trouble to make out that OE *Swiðrædingdænn* is not derived from OE *Swiðræd*, but from OE *swiðra* 'right' (hand). Of course, names in *-denn* with an *ing*-derivative as first el. are common in Kent, as Benenden, Halden, Rolvenden.

Wymering is placed in the Isle of Wight instead of in the mainland of Hants. On the other hand Arreton is removed from Wight to Wilts. On p. 28 (PNP) Alfreton and Badminton are given wrong forms. Several OE names are stated to be lost that are still in use. In PNP n:o 29 *Alchmundingtun* is Alkington Gloucs, n:o 40 *Æþeredingetun*, Ardington Berks, n:o 42 *Helmerdington*, Hilmarton Wilts. In EP n:o 10 *Cuðredesdone* is Coulsdon Surrey, n:o 31 *Eardulfeslea*, Ardley Oxon (cf. ERN p. 56), n:o 51 *Alwartune*, Alderton Ess (nr

Dibden, *Tippedene* in the same charter), n:o 53 *Wynsigestun*, Wonston Hants, n:o 61 *Cynemærestun*, Crimchard Somerset (see EPPN, p. 64), n:o 87 *Gislheresuuyrth*, doubtless Isleworth Midds.

Several important names are omitted, especially in EP, where the author could not rely on the work of other scholars to the same extent as in PNP. Under *hām* we miss *Hunewaldesham* BCS 563 (now lost), under *lēah* *Lopereslege* BCS 1050, Kinnersley He (*Cyrdesleah* KCD 755, *Kynardesle* 1242 Fees), under *stan* Brixton Surrey, under *tūn* Kinvaston Staffs (*Kinwaldestun* 996), under *trēo* Elstree Herts (*Tiðulfestreo* BCS 245), under *dūn* Kilmersdon Somerset (*Kunemersdone* BCS 889).

Professor Zachrisson's papers contain some useful negative criticism. The importance of pers. ns as elements of pl. ns has doubtless been to some extent overrated. Professor Zachrisson's criticism may stimulate thought and cause scholars to attempt to find better sources for difficult elements than unrecorded pers. ns or else to take more care to explain postulated names etymologically. On the other hand it is obvious that he himself goes to a far greater excess in undervaluing the importance of pers. ns than the scholars criticised by him do in the other direction. It is clearly as great a methodical error to undervalue the importance of pers. ns as to overestimate it. There is no doubt a certain amount of truth in the so called "terminal test." Habitative names far more often contain pers. ns than pure nature-names. But this, I think, is generally admitted or at least understood. And it cannot be denied that elements such as *dūn* or *hyll* are often combined with pers. ns. The reason is not far to seek. *Dūn* does not always mean 'hill.' It often means 'hill pasture.' Hence the common name Kingsdown 'the king's hill pasture.' Such a name is not a nature-name pure and simple. Even *burna* 'stream' is sometimes combined with pers. ns. A safe case is Simonburn Nb 'Sigemund's stream.' A stream was an economic asset because of its fish or of a water-fall, and could be named from its owner. Also a stream could be named from an accident that had befallen a certain person in it. Professor Zachrisson adduces a similar explanation for Kempsford Gl (*Cynemæresford* 800 AS Chron), though in this case with doubtful justification, for there is nothing to suggest that the ford got its name after the battle fought near it in 800. Names in *-ford* often have pers. ns as first element.

The positive contributions to English place-name etymology in the two papers are of slight value. Examples of the etymological method used have been given. It may be added that even in cases where etymologies do not imply new words of doubtful authenticity they are often far-fetched and improbable. No doubt there are a few good or useful etymological suggestions, though not all of them are new. Apart from the etymologies the books contain useful suggestions or observations.

*Heilige und Heiligenlegende in England. Studien zum 16. und 17. Jahrhundert.* Erster Band. By RUDOLF KAPP. Halle: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. xiii + 372.

This is an unusually able book, which ought to be read by everyone interested in the literary and religious currents of the sixteenth century. Although Dr. Kapp's set purpose was to write a history of what happened to saints and their legends during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he really has accomplished, in this first volume, a good deal more than the title indicates. Using legends for guidance, he has traced the cultural history of the period and has succeeded admirably in clarifying certain aspects of it. The achievement is the more notable in that he has used for the basis of his study a form which was, if not decadent, at least what biologists call "recessive." I daresay that I have had occasion to acquaint myself with more of his material than most persons; and I can bear witness both to the breadth of his reading and to the illuminating treatment he has given his subject.

After a brief discussion of the many twists to which the terms "legend" and "saint" have been submitted in the course of time,<sup>1</sup> he devotes a chapter to the *Golden Legend*, showing that the great popularity of Caxton's translation had diminished by 1538, the year in which the tomb of Thomas of Canterbury was destroyed and Cromwell ordered that sermons should be based only on the Scriptures. It is significant that the last edition should have appeared in 1527, for unquestionably the authority of legends declined during the earlier decades of the century. It is also significant, as showing the cross-currents of the period, that John Mirk's *Festial*, which was printed twice as often as the *Golden Legend*, seems to have continued in use by preachers much longer than the greater work. Dr. Kapp makes one of his infrequent slips (p. 49) in assuming that the *Festial* is little more than a compendium based on the *Golden Legend*. A forthcoming book by my colleague Professor Albert Elsasser will make this point abundantly clear.

In a third chapter Dr. Kapp presents a valuable analysis of the early prints of individual legends, basing it in part on the day-book of John Dorne, the Oxford bookseller. He has found prints of twenty-five legends, and rightly supposes that others may be lost. In this connection I wish to indicate a few minor errors on Dr. Kapp's part and my own. The *St. Jerome* in MS. Magdalen College, Oxford, is not an English work (p. 62, on the authority of my *Saints' Legends*, p. 288) but is in Latin. As to the ascription of *St. Bridget* (p. 63) to Gascoigne, see W. P. Cumming, *The Revelations of Saint Birgitta*, 1929, p. xxx, note 2 (*EETS.*, 178). Edward the Confessor (see p. 66) was not canonized or regarded

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Kapp ought to read H. Delehaye, *Sanctus*, 1927.

as a saint by anybody until the Angevin kings found it a convenience. Dr. Kapp is far too kind in excusing me (p. 66) for having called Hatfield's *St. Ursula* a work in prose.

The story the author tells in a series of chapters concerning saints and their legends during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary is far too complicated to summarize briefly, but it is one of the most valuable sections of his book. He has succeeded in defining the varying attitudes of humanists and reformers, has shown the rise of antiquarian interest coincident with destructive zeal, and has not failed to note the lagging conservatism of people at large. As always, England in the sixteenth century had her fiery radicals and stubborn die-hards, her trimmers and cool-headed men of intellect. Through passions and through muddlings they worked out characteristically the not ignoble compromise of Elizabeth's reign, when Foxe could make an Anglican legend-book and Spenser give new and lasting significance to old material in his poetry. Not the least interesting of the author's chapters is the final one on Spenser's attitude to legends and his use of them. I think that Dr. Kapp, here as elsewhere, tends to make too sharp a distinction between Puritans and Anglicans, since Puritans in Elizabeth's time were after all Anglicans; but this does not invalidate his conclusions.

Besides all this, there is a useful account of chap-books containing legendary material<sup>2</sup> and a chapter on legends in the religious poetry of Elizabeth's reign. In the latter he prints some hitherto inedited verse by William Forrest from MS. Harleian 1703, though he oddly slurs over the *Theophilus* without comment. I should like to note, in concluding this review of an excellent book, that the similarity of the Placidus story to that of Job (p. 319) was recognized long before Caxton's *Golden Legend* appeared, and that Partridge's poem on this theme still seems to me a very dull piece of work.

GORDON HALL GEROULD

Princeton University

---

*Der Sabbath in England: Wesen und Entwicklung des englischen Sonntags.* By Dr. MAX LEVY (*Kölner anglistische Arbeiten*, vol. 18). Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1933. Pp. 297.

Dr. Levy introduces his subject with observations upon the value for rest and contemplation in the observance of a rhythmically recurrent day. He next considers the Jewish week with its Sabbath, and such analogues in ancient civilization as the *nundinae* and planet-week. The rest of the book, rich in illustrative matter,

<sup>2</sup> As to Eustace (p. 233) Dr. Kapp should have noted A. H. Krappe, *Nuovi Studi Medievali*, III, 223-258 (1926-7).



presents fully the historical development of the Lord's Day in theory and observance in England from the earliest times up to the year 1932—the legislation with respect to Sunday; the views or testimony of theologians and secular authors (not excepting Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, and George Herbert) on the question of the name of Sabbath, or the relation of Sunday to the Jewish Sabbath, or the obligations involved in observance, and kindred matters; comparisons at different periods with the Continental Sunday; and the influences brought to bear at different times, for example, that of the Bible in the age of Elizabeth, and, in the last century, of the industrial revolution, the social-hygienic philosophy, the English week-end, and the English attitude to sports. Rigorism, inherited from the Puritans, has weakened, the author contends, because the ascetic element in it failed eventually to reflect the culture of the people and to express an inner need.

For the Middle Ages Dr. Levy makes considerable use of the contributions of Wilhelm Thomas. A reading of G. R. Owst's recent *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* leads one to expect that a fuller acquaintance than we now have with mediaeval sermons will bring to light further valuable testimony on the English Sunday of that period.

Some typographical errors are noticeable in both German and English sections of the text, but they do no great damage. There is a useful book-list at the end of the volume. This is an interesting and very serviceable book. One misses a helpful classification of doctrinal theories like that in the first of Hessey's Bampton Lectures, but the account here is much more thorough, and, of course, has the advantage of being up-to-date.

HARRY CAPLAN

*Cornell University*

---

*Godes Peace and the Queenes: Vicissitudes of a House 1539-1615.*

By NORREYS JEPHSON O'CONOR. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. vi + 154. \$2.50.

This book brings forward the highly important question of the scholarly standards that should be maintained in the publications of a university press. Mr. O'Connor has written an excellent volume which is a decided addition to historical literature. I am unwilling to enter the controversy as to what percentage of his sources were already in print. Few laymen pass their leisure moments glancing through the *Acts of the Privy Council*. Mr. O'Connor has made available to the general reader a selection of documents of great interest to the student of Elizabethan life. The story centers in the Oxfordshire mansion house of Weston-on-the-Green. While Mr. O'Connor devotes a fair number of pages to its actual

owners, Lord Williams of Thame and his son-in-law, Lord Norris of Rycote, he seems far more interested in the erratic Henry Clinton, second earl of Lincoln, whose diverse misdeeds included a violent attack on the house at Weston. This exposition of what could happen in "Godes Peace and the Queenes" and of how far an Elizabethan earl could transgress with impunity should form an excellent antidote to text-book remarks on the effectiveness of Tudor discipline. I recommend this book to all who are interested in the period.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. O'Connor's work lacks the meticulous accuracy in regard to details which one expects in a publication of the Harvard University Press. For instance there appears in the index the astonishing entry "Northumberland, Earl of (Charles Neville)." It is not a mere slip, for there is also "Neville, Charles, see Northumberland, Earl of." Thomas Percy was the earl of Northumberland, and Charles Neville the earl of Westmoreland. Both are mentioned on page 44, but only Northumberland is in the index. Again on page 43 the author speaks of Sir Richard Fiennes, "who was accepted by King Henry VI as Lord Dacre of the South." He goes on to say that "In 1533 Sir Richard was succeeded as Lord Dacre by his grandson." The *Complete Peerage*, which Mr. O'Connor gives as his authority, shows that Sir Richard did not set a record for longevity, but died in 1483. It was his grandson and successor who died in 1533. While errors of this sort are of little importance in themselves, they shake the reader's confidence in the accuracy of Mr. O'Connor's research.

A far more serious matter is Mr. O'Connor's casual treatment of quotations. Scholarly convention demands that if the original spelling be retained, it should be rendered with absolute accuracy. None of the quotations in this book which I have compared with the source given is completely correct. Particularly annoying is the replacing of single words such as *deceased* and *said* on page 82 with the dots which mark an omission. Finally, Mr. O'Connor, despite his affection for dots, does not place them at the end of his quotations. Hence the reader has no way of knowing how much of a letter he has chosen to print.

None of these criticisms need disturb the general reader. For him Mr. O'Connor has produced a valuable and highly entertaining book. It is lively, well written, and well illustrated and deserves a warm welcome from all lovers of Tudor England. The very excellence of the book makes it all the more deplorable that it should be marred by unnecessary inaccuracies.

SIDNEY PAINTER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*The Early Career of Alexander Pope.* By GEORGE SHERBURN.  
Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1934. Pp. viii + 326. \$5.00.

Professor Sherburn has in this book made so important a contribution to our knowledge of Pope's career, down to the years just preceding the *Dunciad* of 1728, that all scholars will earnestly hope for a further volume which shall deal in similar fashion with the remaining decades. His three-hundred-odd pages are crowded with matter. Besides making thorough use of such generally accessible sources as Spence, Nichols, and the correspondence printed by Elwin-Courthope, he has read widely in the periodical and ephemeral literature of the period, and has had access to unpublished manuscripts both in the British Museum and the Huntington Library. So full is the documentation, that the volume becomes a source-book for Pope's biography indispensable for every serious student.

Pope has been unfortunate in his biographers—as Mr. Sherburn makes plain in his discriminating Introduction dealing with "Earlier Biographers." They have usually been ready to accept in all doubtful cases the interpretation most damaging to Pope. Though Mr. Sherburn undertakes no indiscriminate whitewashing, he does not forget the elementary principle of justice which assures to the accused the benefit of reasonable doubt. He declines to condemn Pope on evidence which, carefully analysed, turns out to be only the unsupported assertion of an angry enemy. It is, for example, only on the evidence of Dennis himself that biographers have represented Pope as persuading Lintot to publish Dennis's hostile Remarks on Addison's *Cato*. In the whole episode of Pope's witty retort to Dennis, it is Addison rather than Pope who seems to have acted with something less than straightforward honesty.

One of the most significant of Mr. Sherburn's chapters is that which considers the relations of Pope and Addison. The evidence here presented gives abundant justification for the famous "character" of "Atticus" as "willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike." I do not see how one can fail to accept Mr. Sherburn's conclusion that Addison was directly concerned in Tickel's rival translation of Homer, and that the publication of Tickel's first book of the *Iliad*, just two days later than Pope's first volume, was so timed that it might do greatest harm to Pope. It seems clear also that Addison was privy to the attack of Burnet and Duckett in *Homerides*: "or a Letter to Mr. Pope occasion'd by his intended Translation of Homer." No wonder Pope thought Addison jealous of the rising reputation of a younger "brother near the throne." Equally significant is the chapter entitled "The

Ethics of Collaboration," which is concerned with the translation of the *Odyssey*. From this episode Pope emerges much less happily than from his quarrel with Addison. If Mr. Sherburn's presentation of the facts makes Pope's conduct somewhat more understandable, it makes no attempt to clear him from the guilt of deliberate misrepresentation.

Mr. Sherburn himself expresses regret that he has been so "ploddingly factual," and his reviewer must confess to some disappointment at finding that in these pages Pope is so often a mere focal point of controversy, and so seldom steps forth as a poet or comes to life as an imaginatively realized personality. But the garnering of facts and the dispassionate sifting of evidence is peculiarly necessary in the case of an author who has been so often and so seriously the subject of hostile prejudice. Mr. Sherburn has done, and done well, a very useful task, and has probably been wise in deciding that he could not combine with it very much of literary appraisal or imaginative portraiture. He is fully justified in his modest hope that his book "may serve as a preliminary to better criticism of Pope."

ROBERT K. ROOT

*Princeton University*

---

*Observations on Some Tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics, Chiefly in Minor Poetry and Essay in the Eighteenth Century until the Execution of Dr. W. Dodd in 1777.* By JOHANNES HENDRIK HARDER. Amsterdam: 1933. Pp. 320.

Anticipating criticism of his extended discussion of melancholy in his opening chapters, Dr. Harder explains that "the history of humanitarianism is so closely linked to the mood that a discussion of the manifestations of some of its tendencies in English literature was unavoidable." Unfortunately, the author, though he enumerates sundry passages from seventeenth-century works that mention or deal with melancholy, fails to show a basic relation between it and the spirit of humanitarianism.

It is in Burton, if anywhere, that Harder finds "melancholy the favourable atmosphere for the cultivation of gloomy as well as charitable and Utopian thoughts," and the thirty-six pages immediately following his analysis of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* contribute little or nothing to the development of his thesis. This material with adequate references could have been put in a compact footnote. Such a procedure would have added somewhat to the continuity of treatment, a quality sadly lacking throughout the whole book. With very little illuminative interpretation, passage after passage is quoted from poets and essayists, mostly minor, and listed under forty-one chapter headings such as "Melancholy,"

"Elegiac Poetry," "Interest in Beggars," "God's Wisdom in the Universe," "Michael Montaigne," "Slavery," "Lunacy," and "Freemasonry." The work lacks direction and definiteness. It is full of disjunctive reasoning, irrelevancy, and superfluous itemization (pp. 55-56, bottom of p. 57, 86 ff.) Nowhere does Harder specifically clarify the contribution which the melancholy theme made to the development of humanitarianism in literature. Neither the text nor the bibliography reveals any awareness of Reed's *The Background of Gray's Elegy* (1924) and Draper's *The Funeral Elegy* (1929). Knowledge of Miss Reed's work would have made many observations unnecessary, for example, the criticism of H. H. Clark's statement that Parnell "restored melancholy to literature" (p. 59).

There is no index.

HERBERT DRENNON

*State Teachers College, Murray, Kentucky*

*S. T. Coleridge's Treatise on Method as published in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana.* Edited with Introduction, Manuscript Fragments, and Notes for a Complete Collation with the Essays on Method in "The Friend" by ALICE D. SNYDER. London: Constable & Co., 1934. Pp. xxviii + 92. 6s.

In 1818 the first volume of a new "methodical" Encyclopaedia, the *Metropolitana*, appeared with a *Preliminary Treatise on Method* by Coleridge. This introductory treatise appeared in a form, as Coleridge put it, "bedeviled" by the editors. Since the manuscript of the *Treatise* has disappeared, it is impossible to tell the extent of the alteration. But Coleridge at least saw fit to reproduce the substance of the *Treatise*, much of it *verbatim*, in scattered essays in the third volume of *The Friend* (also published in 1818). He not only wrote the *Preliminary Treatise* but planned the Encyclopaedia as a whole. This plan was later altered and partly abandoned, but it did much to influence the Encyclopaedia and to enlist the interest of contributing scholars.

Professor Snyder has performed a real service in making accessible a work of Coleridge that was difficult to obtain as well as in supplying careful textual criticism and an illuminating discussion of the occasion of the *Treatise* and its rôle in Coleridge's intellectual history. In so doing she has successfully challenged "certain assumptions about this work, first, that the *Treatise* is essentially the same as the essays on method in *The Friend*, and second, that if the two do show marked differences, *The Friend* contains all that is truly Coleridge's."

The *Treatise* expresses some of the fundamentals of its author's

eclectic, and rather "tender-minded" philosophy. Although these ideas are familiar to the readers of Coleridge's other prose works, many will prefer the more succinct and untheological account now made accessible. The application of Coleridge's thought, moreover, to the problem of ordering an Encyclopaedia has a certain amount of independent interest. Since he believes that order is largely mind-imposed, rather than inherent in external nature, he believes that the key to an understanding of order, and also the key to method or the ordering of thought, must be a psychological principle. He finds this principle in the progressive character of the mind itself, in its growth from sense and instinct to pure reason, imagination, and faith. He supposes that he has thus discovered a hierarchy of mental phases, to which the various sciences correspond, each fitting in its appropriate place in the scale.

Students of Romantic poetry will be interested in the similarity of various doctrines stated in the *Treatise* and the ideas expressed by Wordsworth, especially in *The Prelude*. Both writers stress the importance of the development of mental life according to "a principle of unity with progression"; both maintain that the progress of the mind and the unity of thought depend upon a vigorous "mental initiative"; both think that "the state of Mind adapted to such progress holds a due mean between a passiveness under external impression, and an excessive activity of mere reflection"; both conjecture that this progress follows a path "predetermined" by truths "in the Mind itself" and "originating in the Mind"; both conceive that such a truth, or transcendental idea, appears at first in the child as "a mere *instinct*, a vague appetency towards something which the Mind incessantly hunts for," and that it emerges only gradually as a clear and distinct idea; both entertain the optimistic religious faith that "everything around us is full of blessings," and that the mind tends to develop in beneficent fashion from mood and sensation to imagination and intellect; both believe that "the Poetical Method requires . . . a preponderance of pleasureable feeling," and that the arts are "applied to the purposes of pleasure through the medium of the Imagination"; and both retain a trace of the "doctrine of perfectibility," regarding "all that is Human in Human Nature, and all that in Nature is above herself, as together working forward that far deeper and more permanent revolution in the Moral World of which the recent changes in the Political World may be regarded as the pioneering whirlwind and storm." Thus the *Treatise* helps to confirm a view that has rapidly been gaining ground that Wordsworth and Coleridge cannot be understood apart from their influence on each other. Perhaps the main interest of present-day scholars in the *Treatise* will be directed to an examination of this evidence.

*Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834.* By CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD. New Haven: Yale University Press. Pp. 346. \$2.50.

Many statements have been made about the influence of German thought, particularly German philosophical thought, upon the formation of Carlyle's ultimate point of view. The majority of these have been general statements founded upon no adequate investigation, but belonging rather in the category of "impressions." The most important contributions to the subject hitherto are doubtless Camille Bos's *Le Kantisme de Carlyle* (1902) and Margaret Storr's *The Relation of Carlyle to Kant and Fichte* (1929). For about ten years Professor Harrold has been devoting himself to a patient first-hand investigation of the material both primary and secondary. With an adequate background of philosophy he has been able to do what could not be done by many English scholars. It will be a long time before his work can be superseded, if, indeed, there should be any need of doing the task again.

It seems to me that Mr. Harrold has gone about his study in the right frame of mind. He rightly considers Carlyle not as a philosopher, but "as a man of letters indebted in a peculiar degree to those metaphysical inquiries which he constantly thought of as symptomatic of disease in a man or an age." A man of letters possessed of a mind like Carlyle's finds many intellectual affinities, in consequence of which it is easy for the unwary to suspect borrowings where they do not actually exist. Mr. Harrold has avoided this pitfall by basing his primary conclusions upon those borrowings only which are obvious. "A number of secondary elements in Carlyle's doctrines will be seen as indirectly appropriated and then more or less transformed. Still other elements will be considered as striking parallels to certain German doctrines, but as of very doubtful German origin. We shall find Carlyle appropriating, rejecting, transforming. He invaded authors like a monarch, and exercised a royal privilege in ordering his newly acquired possessions according to the requirements of his own domain." That is well said. It is, in fact, a brief summary of the results of a ten year investigation.

Specifically, Mr. Harrold finds that the influence of Kant upon Carlyle has been most exaggerated. "There is no evidence . . . that Carlyle ever understood, or sought to understand, Kant's investigations into the limits of knowledge, or truly sensed the significance of the attempt." It is into the spirit of Fichte's metaphysical system that Harrold believes Carlyle to have penetrated farthest. "It is not too much to say that whenever Carlyle momentarily speaks like a philosopher, it is as a follower of Fichte. Of all the German metaphysicians, Carlyle understood him most naturally and interpreted him with the least sacrifice of the original meaning."

In the end Mr. Harrold reaches a conclusion which on the surface seems not too favorable to Carlyle. "He was not a philosopher but a wanderer among ideas, seeking here and there an echo of his own convictions." Thus it would appear that Carlyle must eventually find his place among the general run of human beings who go about searching not for the truth but for reasons to continue believing as they began. Mr. Harrold discerns too clearly, however, to allow us any such conclusion. He recognizes the spark of genius in Carlyle. To be sure he was no philosopher. At no time would he have attempted to construct a philosophical system. He did not read philosophers with the purpose of comprehending and appropriating their systems. He read them, it seems to me, for their power of stimulation and suggestion. He found that certain passages acted upon his mind as steel acts upon flint. The important thing is the spark which was struck from Carlyle's mind. Mr. Harrold knows this: "'influence,'" he writes, "is too mechanical a term to apply to the discoveries of a mind of such power as Carlyle's"; and for this reason he is a safe guide to those who would thread the mazes of Carlyle's wide reading. Professor Harrold is to be congratulated upon having in the main avoided the jargon of philosophical thought, and consequently upon giving us a book which is genuinely alive. If there be any who think this result is easy of achievement, let them try working upon so great a mass of facts about such subject matter.

WALDO H. DUNN

*College of Wooster*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*A Minor Augustan*, being the Life and Works of George, Lord Lyttelton. By ANANDA VITTAL RAO. Calcutta: The Book Company, 1934. Pp. 387. Lord Lyttelton's career as politician, author and patron of letters has of late attracted considerable attention. In 1927 appeared Bock's dissertation of a hundred pages;<sup>1</sup> Dr. Rao's volume is a thesis at the University of London; and, for almost ten years, Miss R. M. Davis, known for her monograph on Stephen Duck, has been at work on Lyttelton. Dr. Rao is apparently unacquainted with the labors of his German and American colleagues; and, though he adds to our knowledge of Lyttelton, his work can hardly be regarded as final. His elaborate bibliographies are full of general surveys of gardening, politics, and the like; but he seems to have overlooked Chew's specialized paper on Lyttelton's

<sup>1</sup> B. Bock, *George Lord Lyttelton und seine Stellung in der eng. Lit. des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen, 1927.



relation to Rousseau;<sup>2</sup> and, even more serious, though he uses contemporary letters and memoirs, he ignores the many reviews of Lyttelton's work in the *Critical*<sup>3</sup> and the *Monthly*,<sup>4</sup> and makes no reference to such proofs of his influence as *Dialogues of the Living*,<sup>5</sup> *The Vision*,<sup>6</sup> an *Ode to Lyttelton*,<sup>7</sup> and Charles Jenner's *Louisa*. He omits *The Regatta*<sup>8</sup> and John Jones's *Elegy on Winter*, which were inscribed to Lyttelton, and the references to Lyttelton in *Characters of this Age*<sup>9</sup> and in Thomas Francklin's translation of Lucian.

Although there is no evidence of foreign idiom, the style is loose and too often marred by ambiguity of syntax and of pronominal reference. One regrets, moreover, such slips as "Rev. Ayscough,"<sup>10</sup> "drift" for rift,<sup>11</sup> "pay" for play,<sup>12</sup> "*elegantarium*,"<sup>13</sup> "Guilia,"<sup>14</sup> "while" for whereas,<sup>15</sup> and such a sentence as, "There is a very detailed criticism of Gray in the long letter Walpole wrote, and many remarkable opinions."<sup>15</sup>

JOHN W. DRAPER

West Virginia University

---

*Elizabethan and Stuart Plays*. Edited by CHARLES READ BASKERVILL, VIRGIL B. HELTZEL, [and] ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT. New York: Henry Holt and Company, [1934]. Pp. x + 1660. \$5.00. This anthology has the advantage of a somewhat larger compass than other collections of the early drama compiled for class use. Here are forty-two plays (Shakespeare being excluded) beginning with *Roister Doister*, *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, and *Gorboduc*, and extending to *The Broken Heart* and *The Cardinal*. By beginning early the editors are able to illustrate some of the formative influences upon the Elizabethan drama and at the same time to represent adequately the variety of dramatic output during the entire period. Every editor of a collection of plays is necessarily faced with an appallingly large number of titles which must inevitably go into his book. Into this volume the editors have admitted enough of such plays to satisfy most readers, but they are particularly to be congratulated, in other instances, upon some un-

<sup>2</sup> See S. C. Chew, *MLN.*, xxxii, 321.

<sup>3</sup> *E. g. Critical Review*, ix, 390; xiii, 456 *et seq.*; xix, 461; xxix, 316 *et seq.*; xxxiii, 1; xxxiv, i and 81; xxxix, 1 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> *E. g. Monthly Review*, lii, 555; lxvii, 73; lxii, 128 *et seq.*

<sup>5</sup> Reviewed in the *Critical*, xiii, 519-520.

<sup>6</sup> Reviewed in the *Monthly*, lxii, 87.

<sup>7</sup> See *Critical*, xxxvi, 234.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxix, 507; and *Monthly*, lii, 553.

<sup>9</sup> *Monthly*, xix, 434.

<sup>10</sup> Rao, 48.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 141.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 177.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 270.

usual and happy selections. Marlowe is represented not only by *Faustus*, but also by *Edward II* and Part I of *Tamburlaine*; Dekker by *The Honest Whore* as well as by *The Shoemakers' Holiday*; Jonson by a masque as well as by four plays; Beaumont and Fletcher by four plays; and Middleton, Massinger, Ford, and Shirley, by two each. In addition, room has been found for popular pieces like *Cambises*, *Mucedorus*, and even a jig. Taken together, the collection is unusually satisfactory. Editorially, the volume is designed not so much for the scholar as for the reader interested primarily in the literary and dramatic qualities of the plays. The texts are reprints of original early editions, facsimiles of them, or standard modern editions; spelling and punctuation have been modernized; and difficult words and phrases are glossed at the foot of the page on which they occur. Brief biographical and critical headnotes explain the relation of each particular drama to contemporary or previous work.

KARL J. HOLZKNECHT

New York University

---

*Songs from the Restoration Theater.* Edited by WILLARD THORP. Princeton: University Press, 1934. Pp. 138. \$2.50. Twenty-seven Restoration theater songs by Dryden, Congreve, Otway, Lee, Wycherley, Farquhar, Sedley, and seven lesser authors, are reprinted in this attractive volume. The songs themselves will be familiar to most readers; but the original airs, here reproduced in facsimile from the old music books, have not been generally accessible. The notes contain much new and valuable information about the composers and singers of the songs. It is regrettable, in view of the merits of the book, that it does not conform in all respects to the standards of modern scholarship. Lack of space forbids the giving of particular examples, but the following defects of scholarly method are grave enough to be noticed here. (1) The punctuation in the introduction and notes is extraordinarily lax. Non-restrictive relative clauses are seldom set off by commas, and the final comma is often omitted in the citation of dates, page numbers, and scenes. Other errors of punctuation occur. (2) Several mutually inconsistent methods of citing dates, page numbers, and titles are used. Some references are enclosed in parentheses; others are set off by commas. Inclusive page numbers are not cited; often page numbers are not cited at all. Titles are cited both with and without the article. In the general index, one-word titles like *The Funeral* are allowed the article, but multi-word titles like *The Duke of Guise* are not. (3) No table of abbreviations is provided. Hence esoteric symbols like B. M. G. 304 (73), Cal. S. P. Dom., or T. C. Trinity 1699, will be unintelligible to some readers. (4) In the index to songs, first lines beginning

with the word "Ah" are listed before first lines beginning with the indefinite article "A." (5) The sources of the musical facsimiles are not always specified—for example, the facsimile of the music for "Ah false Amyntas, can that hour."

CYRUS L. DAY

*University of Delaware*

*Modern Prose Style.* By BONAMY DOBRÉE. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1934. Pp. viii + 252. \$2.75. Prose anthologies are, for evident reasons, less satisfactory than collections of verse. Mr. Dobrée's work, however, is something more than an anthology; for his selections, usually a page or two long, are carried on a current of discussion of the character of prose style in general, of the types of prose (narrative, description, science, philosophy, and so on), and of the particular characteristics of the passages quoted. The book, therefore, is a kind, though a very informal and inconclusive kind, of rhetoric.

As an anthology, it holds strictly to the limits of its title. Henry James is perhaps the oldest author represented. The rest are nearly all living, many of them still quite young writers: Santayana, Jeans, P. E. More (called 'incurably romantic'), Walter Lippmann; Virginia Woolf, Ford, Hemingway, Faulkner; Griereson, Sacheverel Sitwell; Gertrude Stein, Joyce; and many more.

Concerning so various an assemblage it is evident that few general statements will be possible; and indeed one of the strongest impressions the reader will carry away from the book is that modern rhetoric, having cast away its old formalities and pretensions, has left itself but little to say. Mr. Dobrée, it is true, often attempts a definite, technical analysis of the vocal effects of his authors. He is fond, for instance, of noting how one or another of them prefers to end his sentences: Dean Inge with long syllables and a dying fall, Shaw "sharply, like a hammer-tap, or rattle," Kipling in one place hard and sharp, and again not so much so. But we do not feel after all that we have won any definite knowledge from these analyses. Mr. Dobrée's doctrine is that what we call style is the individual sound of an author's voice conveyed somehow by his written words, and we recognize that the pure aesthetic truth of the matter must be something like that. But then, how to describe the differences of one voice and another? What, in short, becomes of *ars rhetorica*?

M. W. CROLL

*Princeton University*

*Letters of William Michael Rossetti.* Edited by CLARENCE GOEHDES and PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM. Durham: Duke University Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 201. These eighty-seven letters from Rossetti to Anne and Herbert Gilchrist are of particular interest in their revelation of the intense admiration which Whitman aroused in a few of his contemporaries and of the steps which these contemporaries took to promote his reputation and assist him financially. Appendices contain a letter from Rossetti to President Cleveland concerning Whitman, a list of subscribers to the Whitman relief fund, and several communications from Rossetti to Charles Aldrich. A number of the letters have been previously published in part, but this is the first attempt at their accurate and complete reproduction. A good index contributes to the usability of the volume, which should also be of value to any one interested in Rossetti's work as editor of Blake and Shelley.

LEON HOWARD

*Pomona College*

---

*American Literature: A Period Anthology.* OSCAR CARGILL, General Editor. New York: Macmillan, 1933. I, to 1830, ed. R. E. SPILLER, pp. xv + 758, \$1.50; II, 1830-1860, ed. T. McDOWELL, pp. xiii + 744, \$1.50; III, 1860-1888, ed. L. WANN, pp. xvi + 805, \$1.50; IV, 1888-1914, ed. O. CARGILL, pp. xv + 649, \$1.35; V, since 1914, ed. J. H. NELSON, pp. xv + 506, \$1.25. It is unfortunate that the bulk and expense of these volumes may preclude their wide use as class texts. Few colleges offer period courses in American literature and students in the usual survey course could hardly be expected to purchase a five-volume anthology. As a scholarly contribution the work is admirable, despite a certain unevenness, perhaps inevitable in a series edited by different hands. Mr. Spiller's volume is undoubtedly the best; its selections from the early travelers and the section devoted to Indian songs and legends represent material seldom encountered in such a work. One full-length and two one-act plays are hardly an adequate guide to the development of American drama. Nor do chapters from the novels of Brown, Cooper, Stowe, Norris, Sinclair, and more recent writers constitute an effective means of studying the American novel.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

# INDEX

PAGE	PAGE
Abele, T., W. Göcking und M. J. Böhnert (eds.), <i>Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten</i> .. 123	<i>Arden of Feversham</i> ..... 168
Able, A. H., 3rd, <i>George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence</i> ..... 407	Ariosto, Desportes and —: <i>Additional Sources in the Orlando and the Liriche</i> ..... 174
Accent allemand dans Balzac, L'— ..... 382	Arnold, H. H., <i>The Most Difficult Passage of Don Quijote</i> 182; cf. 375
Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset, Some —..... 457	<i>arride</i> , Victorian and —..... 328
Aesthetics of William Hazlitt: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism, The — 407	Art and Artifice in Shakespeare 200
Alcott, The Orient in American Transcendentalism, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and — 58	<i>Art de Régner</i> in XVIIth Century French Tragedy, L'—... 417
Allen, D. C., <i>Hotspur's Earthquake</i> ..... 171	<i>Art of Limming, The</i> —..... 64
American Landscape, William Bartram, Interpreter of the — —..... 54	Arthurian Legend, Hakewill and the — —..... 462
— Literature: A Period Anthology (ed. O. Cargill and others) ..... 556	Attribution to Suckling, An — 463
— Transcendentalism, The Orient in — —, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott 58	Aubin, R. A., <i>Saint-Amant as "Preromantic"</i> ..... 456
Analogue to <i>The Prioresses Tale</i> , Another —..... 307	Audra, E., <i>L'Influence française dans l'oeuvre de Pope</i> ..... 475
Anderson, F., <i>A Primer of Romance Philology</i> ..... 342	Ault, N.: C. L. Day (ed.), <i>The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey</i> .. 118
Angelsächsisch, <i>Heldenstolz und Würde im —en. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im Beowulfepos</i> 108	Author's Changes in Dryden's <i>Conquest of Granada, Part I</i> 360
Anglo-Norman, <i>From Latin to Modern French, with especial consideration of</i> —..... 130	Authorship of <i>The Christmas Prince</i> , The —..... 501
Anthology of the Classical Period of German Literature 276	Avramiotti, Chateaubriand se méprend-il sur —?..... 249
Anti-Slavery Opinion in the Poems of Some Early French Followers of James Thomson 427	<i>Asiochus</i> of Plato Translated by Edmund Spenser, The — 191
Antike, <i>Vorträge 1930-1931: England und die</i> —..... 62	Bader, A. L., <i>The Modena Troupe in England</i> ..... 367
Appalachians, <i>English Folk Songs from the Southern</i> — (eds. C. J. Sharp and Maud Karpeles) ..... 102	Baillet, Voltaire and —'s <i>Manual of Pseudonyms</i> ..... 209
Appreciation of Poetry, The — 480	Bald, R. C.: E. Blunden, Charles Lamb and his Contemporaries 271
	Baldwin, S. E., Charles Kingsley 482
	Ballad, <i>The Origin of a</i> —... 465
	—s and <i>Sea Songs of Newfoundland</i> (eds. Elizabeth B. Greenleaf and Grace Y. Mansfield) ..... 102
	Baltimore Newspapers, Four of Poe's Critiques in the —... 251
	Balzac, <i>L'Accent allemand dans</i> — ..... 382
	Bandy, W. T., <i>Baudelaire Judged by His Contemporaries (1845-1867)</i> ..... 46
	Bartram, William —, Interpreter of the American Landscape ..... 54

	PAGE		PAGE
Baskervill, C. R., V. B. Heltzel and A. H. Nethercot (eds.), Elizabethan and Stuart Plays	553	<i>Biographia Britannica</i> , Goldsmith's <i>Life of Bolingbroke</i> and the —	25
Baucke, L., Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's <i>Vanity Fair</i>	274	Blodgett, H., Walt Whitman in England	408
Baudelaire and <i>Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens</i>	446	Blunden, E., Charles Lamb and his Contemporaries	271
— Judged by His Contemporaries (1845-1867)	46	Bodel, Wine Reckonings in —'s <i>Jeu de S. Nicolas</i>	9
Baudin, M., <i>L'Art de Régner</i> in Seventeenth Century French Tragedy	417	Böhnert, M. J., W. Göcking und T. Abele (eds.), Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten	123
—: L. H. Skinner, Collin d'Harleville Dramatist	133	<i>Bolingbroke, Goldsmith's Life of — and the Biographia Britannica</i>	25
Baugh, A. C., The Chronology of French Loan-Words in English	90	Book-Pirates, Elizabethan	137
Baum, P. F. and C. Gohdes (eds.), Letters of William Michael Rossetti	556	Bouhours, Le Père — et le Tasse	434
Beall, C. B., Le Père Bouhours et le Tasse	434	<i>Bourgeois gentilhomme</i> , La Marquise du —	369
Beatrice: "My Lady Disdain"	494	Bourl'honne, P., George Eliot: Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-1854	275
Beaumarchais, The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of —	404	Boyce, B., A Restoration "Improvement" of Thomas Dekker	460
Beck, T. J., Northern Antiquities in French Learning and Literature (1755-1855)	47	Boynton, P. H.: A Christy, The Orient in American Transcendentalism, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott	58
Bédé, J.-A.: A. Feuillerat, Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman	43	Brace of Villains, A —	168
Belphegor in <i>Grim the Collier</i> and Riche's <i>Farewell</i>	99	<i>Bradamante</i> , Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's —	169
Bengesco, Corrections and Additions to —'s <i>Bibliographie</i>	440	Bredvold, L. I.: R. N. Cunningham, Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718: A Biographical and Critical Study	403
<i>Beowulf</i> , 489-490	89	—: F. Saxl (ed.), Vorträge 1930-1931: England und die Antike	62
—, Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in —	88	Brenner, C. D., Some Notes on Volange and Janot	18
—epos, Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im —	108	Brentano, Der Prosastil in den Märchen Clemens —s	138
Berquin, Arnaud	238	<i>Brittons Bowre of Delights</i> , 1591 (ed. H. E. Rollins)	115
Beys, Lope's <i>Peregrino</i> , Hardy, Rotrou, and —	75	Brontë, Charlotte, <i>Legends of Angria</i> (eds. Fannie E. Rathford and W. C. De Vane)	121
Bibel und deutsche Kultur	471	Brooke, T.: M. Eccles, Christopher Marlowe in London	203
Bible, Luther's German	397	—: C. B. Judge, Elizabethan Book-Pirates	137
<i>Bibliographie</i> , Corrections and Additions to Bengesco's —	440	Brown, Eleanor G., Milton's Blindness	402
<i>Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois</i>	128	Brown, Tom, <i>The Stage Beaus toss'd in a Blanket</i>	506
Binyon, L. (tr.), Dante's <i>Inferno</i>	68		

PAGE	PAGE
Browning, The Shorter Poems of Robert — (ed. W. C. De Vane) ..... 486	Classics into English from — to Chapman, 1477-1620.... 195
Buck, P. M., Jr.: Elizabeth C. Hickson, The Versification of Thomas Hardy..... 61	Centeno, A., <i>La Nochebuena de 1836</i> y su modelo horaciano. 441
Burke, The Date of —'s <i>Sublime and Beautiful</i> ..... 29	—, Sobre el pasaje del Quijote referente al <i>Tirant lo Blanch</i> 375
Burnaby, Lessing and —..... 225	Cervantes, <i>Don Quijote</i> .... 182, 375
Bush, D.: F. M. Padelford (ed.), The <i>Asiarchus</i> of Plato Trans- lated by Edmund Spenser... 191	Chambers, E. K., Sir Thomas Wyatt and Some Collected Studies ..... 207
Byrd, William, <i>History of the Dividing Line betwixt Vir- ginia and North Carolina</i> .... 87	—, The English Folk-Play.. 114
Cailliet, E., The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction (tr. Lorraine Havens) ..... 413	Chapman, Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to —, 1477-1620.... 195
Cameron, Alice, A Note on Desportes and Du Bellay... 378	Chappell, L. W., Another "Can- terbury Tale" ..... 87
—, Desportes and Ariosto: Additional Sources in the <i>Or- lando</i> and the <i>L'riche</i> ..... 174	—, John Henry: a Folk-lore Study ..... 485
Cangé, The Staging of the <i>Miracles de Notre Dame par personnages</i> of the MS. —.. 50	Chateaubriand, Another Femi- nine Answer to —'s Slighting Remarks Made About Venice in 1806..... 243
"Canterbury Tale," Another — ..... 87	—, La Terre et les morts dans l'œuvre de —..... 474
Caplan, H.: M. Levy, Der Sab- bath in England..... 544	— se méprend-il sur Avra- miotti? ..... 249
Care and Carelessness in Hardy 41	—, Shaw, and Sannazaro.... 346
Cargill, O. and others (ed.), American Literature: A Period Anthology ..... 556	Chaucer, A Possible Relation between —'s Long Lease and the Date of his Birth..... 318
Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834 ..... 551	—, Geoffrey — and the De- velopment of his Genius.... 111
Carnahan, D. H.: E. Eggli et P. Martino, Le Débat roman- tique en France, 1813-1830... 134	—, <i>House of Fame</i> ..... 312
—: Olga Longi, La Terre et les morts dans l'œuvre de Chateaubriand ..... 474	—, <i>Knight's Tale</i> ..... 296
Carpenter, F. I. (ed.), Ralph Waldo Emerson: Representa- tive Selections..... 416	—, <i>Miller's Tale</i> ..... 311
Carrière, J.-M., A French Adap- tation of <i>Sandford and Merton</i> 238	—, <i>Prioresses Tale</i> ..... 307
Carritt, E. F. (tr.), B. Croce, The Defence of Poetry, Varia- tions on the Theme of Shelley 480	—, The Complete Works of Geoffrey — (ed. F. N. Robin- son) ..... 329
Cassidy, F. G., Suggested Re- punctuation of a Passage in <i>Beowulf</i> ..... 83	—, <i>Troilus and Criseyda</i> .... 277
Caxton, Translations from the	—iana, The Date of the <i>Troilus</i> : and Minor —..... 277
	—'s Friar, A Note on — 83
	—'s <i>ladyes foure and twenty</i> 85
	—'s Pardoner's Prologue, A Note on ..... 310
	—'s <i>Shipman's Tale</i> : The Lover's Gift Regained..... 335
	—'s Use of Proverbs..... 332
	Chekhov, Katherine Mansfield and ..... 394
	Chénier, André..... 427
	Chew, S. C.: C. K. Hyder, Swin- burne's Literary Career and Fame ..... 59
	Chickering, Geraldine J., The Origin of a Ballad..... 465

PAGE	PAGE
Chinard, G.: R. L. Evans, <i>Les Romantiques français et la musique</i> ..... 412	Changes in Dryden's ———, <i>Part I</i> ..... 360
Chivalry, Elizabethan — and the Faerie Queene's Annual Feast ..... 158	Conrad, A. Source of —'s <i>Suspense</i> ..... 390
Christ a Fury? ..... 41	——, The Plot of —'s <i>The Duel</i> ..... 385
<i>Christmas Prince</i> , The Authorship of <i>The</i> — — ..... 501	<i>Consentement forcé, L'Été de la Saint-Martin</i> and <i>Le</i> — —... 21
Christy, A., The Orient in American Transcendentalism, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott ..... 58	Contes de fées du Grand Siècle ..... 413
Chronology of French Loan-Words in English, The —... 90	Cooper, L.: N. B. Fagin, William Bartram, Interpreter of the American Landscape.... 54
Churchill, I. L., Editions of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith ..... 464	Copernican System, Thomas Digges, the — —, and the Idea of the Infinity of the Universe in 1576 ..... 415
<i>Cyperis de Vigneaux</i> , The Date of — — — ..... 343, 345	Corrections and Additions to Bengesco's <i>Bibliographie</i> ... 440
<i>City-Madam</i> , The Printer's Copy for <i>The</i> — — ..... 173	Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray, The — (eds. E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley) 60
——, see also Massinger.	Crane, R. S.: Elizabeth E. Kent, Goldsmith and his Booksellers ..... 477
Civil War, Walt Whitman and the — — ..... 68	Crist, C. M., Some Judgments of Voltaire by Contemporaries... 439
<i>Cleanness</i> , Glossary and Illustrative Texts (ed. I. Gollancz) 336	Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700, A —... 206
Coffman, G. R., A Note on the Miller's Prologue ..... 311	Criticism of French Comedy, The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century — — — —, A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais ..... 404
Coleridge Marginalia in Jacobi's <i>Werke</i> ..... 216	Croce, B., The Defence of Poetry, Variations on the Theme of Shelley (tr. E. F. Carritt) ..... 480
——, S. T. —'s <i>Treatise on Method</i> as published in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana (ed. Alice D. Snyder) ..... 549	Croll, M. W.: B. Dobrée, Modern Prose Style ..... 555
<i>Colin Clout's Come Home Again</i> , Identifications in — 155	Crowley, F. J., Corrections and Additions to Bengesco's <i>Bibliographie</i> ..... 440
Collin d'Harleville Dramatist 133	——, Some Neglected Letters of Voltaire ..... 215
Columbia University Phonograph Records of Vachel Lindsay's <i>The Congo, Kansas, John L. Sullivan</i> ..... 414	Cunningham, R. N., Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718: A Biographical and Critical Study ..... 403
Comedy, The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French —. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais ..... 404	
Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman ..... 43	Dale, G. I., "Une Tranche de vie" ..... 265
Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, The — (ed. F. N. Robinson) ..... 329	Dante's <i>Inferno</i> (tr. L. Binyon) 68
<i>Congo</i> , Columbia University Phonograph Records of Vachel Lindsay's <i>The</i> —, <i>Kansas, John L. Sullivan</i> ..... 414	Date of Burke's <i>Sublime and Beautiful</i> , The — ..... 29
<i>Conquest of Granada</i> , Author's	



PAGE	PAGE
Date of <i>Oiperis de Vigneaux</i> , The ..... 343, 345	De Vane, W. C. and Fannie E. Ratchford (eds.), Charlotte Brontë, <i>Legends of Angria</i> .. 121
— — Fletcher's <i>The Night- Walker</i> , The ..... 487	Diaries, Two Elizabethan Puri- tan — (ed. M. M. Knappen) 137
— — the <i>Troilus</i> : and Minor Chauceriana, The ..... 277	Diction, Some Aspects of the — of English Poetry..... 416
Daudon, R., <i>L'Accent allemand dans Balzac</i> ..... 382	Digges, Thomas —, the Coperni- can System, and the Idea of the Infinity of the Universe in 1576..... 415
Davenant, Charles..... 506	Dobrée, B., <i>Modern Prose Style</i> 555
Davis, A. K., Jr.: Elizabeth B. Greenleaf and Grace Y. Mansfield (eds.), <i>Ballads and Sea Songs of Newfoundland</i> 102	Dodds, J. W., Thomas Southerne Dramatist ..... 70
—: C. J. Sharp and Maud Karpeles (eds.), <i>English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians</i> ..... 102	<i>Don Quixote</i> , The Most Difficult Passage of — —. 182; cf. 375
Davis, A. L., Fontane and the German Revolution of 1848.. 1	Doolittle, Dorothy, The Rela- tions between Literature and Mediaeval Studies in France from 1820-1860 ..... 48
Davis, B. E. C., Edmund Spen- ser: A Critical Study..... 192	Dorset, Some Additions to the Poems of Lord ..... 457
Day, C. L. (ed.), <i>The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey</i> ..... 118	Draper, J. W.: A. V. Rao, A Minor Augustan . . Life and Works of George, Lord Lyttel- ton ..... 552
—: W. Thorp (ed.), <i>Songs from the Restoration Theater</i> 554	Drennon, H.: J. H. Harder, Ob- servations on Some Tenden- cies of Sentiment and Ethics 548
Day, Thomas, <i>Sandford and Merton</i> ..... 238	—: H. Marwell, Thomas Percy, <i>Studien zur Entste- hungsgeschichte seiner Werke</i> 486
Débat romantique en France, 1813-1830, Le ..... 134	Drew, Helen L., <i>The Date of Burke's Sublime and Beauti- ful</i> ..... 29
<i>De Dominio Civili</i> , A Second MS. of Wyclif's — — ..... 96	Drittes Reich: Die Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung 268
Defence of Poetry, Variations on the Theme of Shelley, The — ..... 480	Dryden Anecdote, A ..... 366
Defoe on Milton..... 31	—, Author's Changes in —'s <i>Conquest of Granada, Part I</i> 360
Dekker, A Restoration "Im- provement" of Thomas —. 460	—'s Letter of Attorney..... 364
Delille, Jacques..... 427	Du Bellay, A Note on Desportes and — ..... 378
<i>Descensus Astraeae</i> , Peele's — — and Marlowe's <i>Edward II</i> 506	DuBois, A. E.: A. H. Able, 3rd, George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence..... 407
Desportes and Ariosto: Addi- tional Sources in the <i>Orlando</i> and the <i>Liriche</i> ..... 174	—, <i>Beowulf</i> , 489-490..... 89
— and Du Bellay, A Note on — ..... 378	—: Ruth C. McKay, George Gissing and his Critic, Frank Swinerton ..... 407
Deutsche Gedichte, Der Kranz, — — aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten (eds. W. Göck- ing, T. Abele und M. J. Böhnert) ..... 123	—: L. H. Meeks, Sheridan Knowles and the Theatre of his Time ..... 56
— Kultur, Bibel und —. 471	—: H. V. Routh, <i>The Nine- teenth Century and After</i> ... 119
— Sage und Dichtung, Die Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in — — ..... 268	
De Vane, W. C. (ed.), <i>The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning</i> ..... 486	

	PAGE		PAGE
DuBois, A. E.: Elisabeth Schneider, The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism	407	Einarsson, S.: L. L. Schücking, Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im Beowulfepos.	108
<i>Duel</i> , The Plot of Conrad's <i>The</i>	385	Ekwall, E.: R. E. Zachrisson, English Place-Name Puzzles	535
Dunmow Flitch, A Mediaeval French Analogue to the —	322	—: —English Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory	535
Dunn, W. H.: L. Baucke, Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's <i>Vanity Fair</i>	274	Eliot, George —: Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-1854	275
—: G. H. Harper (ed.), Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F. R. S. A Correspondence	484	Elizabethan and Stuart Plays (eds. C. R. Baskerville, V. B. Heltzel and A. H. Nethercot)	553
—: C. F. Harrold, Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834	551	— Book-Pirates	137
—: Lorraine Havens (tr.), E. Cailliet, The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction	413	— Chivalry and the Faerie Queen's Annual Feast	158
—: Irene Marinoff, Neue Wertungen im englischen Roman	274	— Puritan Diaries, Two — (ed. M. M. Knappen)	137
Du Pin, Jean, <i>Roman de Mandevie</i>	325	Elson, J. J. (ed.), <i>The Wits; or, Sport upon Sport</i>	139
D'Urfey, The Songs of Thomas — (ed. C. L. Day)	118	Emerson, Ralph Waldo —: Representative Selections (ed. F. I. Carpenter)	416
Dyson, H. V. D. (ed.), Pope, Poetry and Prose	66	—, The Orient in American Transcendentalism, A Study of —, Thoreau and Alcott	58
Early Career of Alexander Pope, The —	547	Encyclopaedia Metropolitana, S. T. Coleridge's <i>Treatise on Method</i> as published in the — (ed. Alice D. Snyder)	549
Eccles, M., Christopher Marlowe in London	203	England, Der Sabbath in —	544
Eckardi, Magistri — Opera Latina (ed. R. Klibansky)	401	—, Heilige und Heiligenlegende in —	543
Editions of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith	464	—, Literature and Pulpit in Mediaeval —	338
<i>Edward II</i> , Peele's <i>Descensus Astraeae</i> and Marlowe's —	506	—, The Modena Troupe in —	367
Edwards, Thomas — and the Editorship of the <i>Faerie Queene</i>	146	—, Vorträge 1930-1931: — und die Antike	62
Eggl, E. et P. Martino, Le Débat romantique en France, 1813-1830	134	Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert	405
1876 English Subscriptions for Whitman, The —	257	Englischer Roman: Neue Wertungen im englischen Roman	274
Eighteenth Century Criticism, The Plot and its Construction in — — of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais	404	English Folk-Play, The —	114
		— Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians (eds. C. J. Sharp and Maud Karpeles)	102
		— Place-Name Puzzles	535
		— Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory	535
		— Poetry, Some Aspects of the Diction of —	416
		—, The Chronology of French Loan-Words in —	90
		<i>Epipsychidion</i> , Two Notes on —	40

PAGE	PAGE
Erzählkunst in Thackeray's <i>Vanity Fair</i> , Die ..... 274	of the Classical Period of German Literature ..... 276
<i>Essay on Pope</i> , Joseph War- ton's — — —, A History of the Five Editions ..... 69	—: W. Silz (ed.), German Romantic Lyrics ..... 123
Essays and Characters: Lamb to Thompson (ed. R. With- ington) ..... 68	—: M. Sommerfeld (ed.), Romantische Lyrik ..... 123
— — —: Montaigne to Gold- smith (ed. R. Withington) .. 68	Feminine Answer to Chateau- briand's Slighting Remarks Made about Venice in 1806, Another — ..... 243
<i>Été de la Saint-Martin</i> and <i>Le</i> <i>Consentement forcé</i> , L'—.... 21	Ferguson, J. D., The Plot of Conrad's <i>The Duel</i> ..... 385
Ethics, Observations on Some Tendencies of Sentiment and — ..... 548	Feuillerat, A., Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman 43
Evans, R. L., Les Romantiques français et la musique ..... 412	First Folio, The Printing of the — — of Shakespeare ..... 139
<b>Faerie Queene</b> , Book II (eds. E. Greenlaw, R. Heffner, J. G. McManaway, E. A. Strath- mann) ..... 186	Fletcher, E. G., A Dryden Anec- dote ..... 366
— — —, Book III (ed. F. M. Padelford) ..... 186	— — —, Defoe on Milton ..... 31
— — —, Elizabethan Chivalry and the — — —'s Annual Feast... 158	Fletcher, The Date of —'s <i>The</i> <i>Night-Walker</i> ..... 487
— — —, Symbolism in — — —, II. 12 ..... 161	Folk-lore, John Henry: a — Study ..... 485
— — —, Thomas Edwards and the Editorship of the — — —.... 146	— — — Play, The English —.... 114
Fagin, N. B., William Bartram, Interpreter of the American Landscape ..... 54	— — — Songs, English — — — from the Southern Appalachians (eds. C. J. Sharp and Maud Karpeles) ..... 102
— — —: O. Cargill and others (ed.), American Literature: A Period Anthology ..... 556	Fontane and the German Revo- lution of 1848 ..... 1
<i>Farewell</i> , Belphegor in <i>Grim</i> <i>the Collier</i> and Riche's —... 99	Forsters, Washington Irving, the Forsters, and the —.... 35
Fecha de <i>Fuente Ovejuna</i> , Sobre la — ..... 179	Fosters, Washington Irving, the — — —, and the Forsters ..... 35
Feise, E., Der Hexameter in Goethes <i>Reineke Fuchs</i> und <i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> ..... 230	<i>Fouke Fitz Warin</i> , The Sources of — ..... 13
— — —: W. Göcking, T. Abele und M. J. Böhnert (eds.), Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahr- hundertern ..... 123	<i>Fourth Boke of Virgill</i> , Surrey's — ..... 198
— — —: Ilse Mahl, Der Prosastil in den Märchen Clemens Brentanos ..... 138	France, The Relations between Literature and Mediaeval Studies in — from 1820-1860 48
— — —: J. Petersen und E. Trunz (eds.), Lyrische Weltichtung in deutschen Übertragungen aus 7 Jahrhunderten ..... 123	Frank, Grace: E. K. Chambers, The English Folk-Play ..... 114
— — —: G. M. Priest, Anthology	— — —: A. Jeanroy, La Poésie lyrique des troubadours ..... 126
	— — —, Wine Reckonings in Bodel's <i>Jeu de S. Nicolas</i> .... 9
	Französische Ödipusdramen, Die — — — ..... 140
	Fredrick, Edna C., <i>L'Été de la</i> <i>Saint-Martin</i> and <i>Le Consente- ment forcé</i> ..... 21
	— — —, The Plot and its Construc- tion in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Rela-

	PAGE		PAGE
tion to the Practice of Beaumarchais .....	404	Heilige und Heiligenlegende in England .....	543
French Adaptation of <i>Sandford and Merton</i> , A .....	238	Ghesel, John, <i>The Rule of Health</i> (ed. H. T. Price) ....	64
— Comedy, The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of — .		Gissing, George — and his Critic, Frank Swinnerton...	407
— A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais .....	404	Glicksberg, C. I., Walt Whitman and the Civil War....	68
— Dramatists, Three — , Racine, Marivaux, Musset...	131	Gloomy Egoist, The .....	64
— Fiction, The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century .....	413	Godes Peace and the Queenes: Vicissitudes of a house 1539-1615 .....	545
— , From Latin to Modern — , with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman .....	130	Göcking, W., T. Abele und M. J. Böhnert (eds.), <i>Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten</i> .....	123
— Learning and Literature, Northern Antiquities in — — (1755-1855) .....	47	Goethe, <i>Der Hexameter in —s Reineke Fuchs und Hermann und Dorothea</i> .....	230
— Loan-Words, The Chronology of — in English....	90	Gohdes, C., <i>The 1876 English Subscription for Whitman</i> ..	257
— Tragedy, <i>L'Art de Régner</i> in XVIIth Century — ....	417	— and P. F. Baum (eds.), <i>Letters of William Michael Rossetti</i> .....	556
Friedman, A., <i>Goldsmith's Life of Bolingbroke and the Biographia Britannica</i> .....	25	Goldsmith and his Booksellers .....	477
From Latin to Modern French, with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman .....	130	—, <i>Editions of Percy's Memoir of</i> .....	464
Froude, Cardinal Newman and William —, F. R. S. A Correspondence (ed. G. H. Harper)	484	—, <i>Essays and Characters: Montaigne to —</i> (ed. R. Withington) .....	68
<i>Fuente Ovejuna</i> , Sobre la fecha de — .....	179	—'s <i>Life of Bolingbroke and the Biographia Britannica</i> ..	25
<i>Fulgens and Lucrez</i> , Notes on — .....	508	Gollancz, I. (ed.), <i>Cleanness</i> , Glossary and Illustrative Texts .....	336
Funke, O., <i>Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert</i> .....	405	Gothonic Nations. Our Forefathers, the — .....	106
Galway, Margaret: B. J. Whiting, Chaucer's Use of Proverbs	332	Grant, E. M., Victor Hugo and the Doctrine of the Right to Work .....	71
Garnier, Kyd's Borrowing from —'s <i>Bradamante</i> .....	169	Gray, <i>The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas</i> — (eds. E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley)	60
German Bible, Luther's — ..	397	Greenlaw, E., R. Heffner, J. G. McManaway, E. A. Strathmann (eds.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book II .....	186
— Literature, Anthology of the Classical Period of — ..	276	—, C. Osgood, F. M. Padelord (eds.), <i>The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition</i> .....	186
— Revolution, Fontane and the — of 1848 .....	1	Greenleaf, Elizabeth B. and Grace Y. Mansfield (eds.),	
— Romantic Lyrics (ed. W. Silz) .....	123		
— Thought, Carlyle and — : 1819-1834 .....	551		
Gerould, G. H.: R. Kapp,			

PAGE	PAGE		
Ballads and Sea Songs of Newfoundland . . . . .	102	Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature (Vol. XV) . . . . .	70
Grierson, H. J. C.: E. Greenlaw, R. Heffner, J. G. McManaway, E. A. Strathmann (eds.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book II . . . . .	186	Hatfield, J. T., New Light on Longfellow . . . . .	272
—: E. Greenlaw, C. Osgood, F. M. Padelford (eds.), <i>The Works of Edmund Spenser</i> , A Variorum Edition . . . . .	186	Hauptmann's <i>Veland</i> , The Symbolism in — . . . . .	258
—: F. M. Padelford (ed.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book III . . . . .	186	Havens, Lorraine (tr.), E. Caillet, <i>The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction</i> . . . . .	413
Griffith, R. H.: W. D. MacClintock, Joseph Warton's <i>Essay on Pope</i> , A History of the Five Editions . . . . .	69	Haviland, T. P., <i>The Roman de longue Haleine on English Soil</i> . . . . .	479
<i>Grim the Collier</i> , Belphegor in — — — and Riche's <i>Farewell</i> . . . . .	99	Hawthorne, Nathaniel — (ed. A. Warren) . . . . .	416
Grubb, Marion, A Brace of Villains . . . . .	168	Hazlitt, The Aesthetics of William —: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism . . . . .	407
—, Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's <i>Bradamante</i> . . . . .	169	Heffner, R.: B. E. C. Davis, Edmund Spenser: A Critical Study . . . . .	192
Gulliver, A Seventeenth Century — . . . . .	32	—, E. Greenlaw, J. G. McManaway, E. A. Strathmann (eds.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book II . . . . .	186
Guyot de Merville, <i>Le Consentement forcé</i> . . . . .	21	—, The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser, 1715 . . . . .	151
Hakewill and the Arthurian Legend . . . . .	462	Heilige und Heiligenlegende in England . . . . .	543
Halévy and Meilhac, <i>L'Été de la Saint-Martin</i> . . . . .	21	Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im Beowulfepos . . . . .	108
Harbage, A., The Authorship of <i>The Christmas Prince</i> . . . . .	501	Heltzel, V. B., C. R. Baskervill and A. H. Nethercot (eds.), <i>Elizabethan and Stuart Plays</i> . . . . .	553
Harder, J. H., Observations on Some Tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics . . . . .	548	Hendel, C. W., Jean-Jacques Rousseau Moraliste . . . . .	266
Hardy, Lope's <i>Peregrino</i> , —, Rotrou, and Beys . . . . .	75	Henning, G. N., Baudelaire and <i>Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens</i> . . . . .	446
Hardy, The Versification of Thomas — . . . . .	61	Henry VIII, New Songs of the Reign of — . . . . .	452
—, Care and Carelessness in — . . . . .	41	Henry, John —: a Folk-lore Study . . . . .	485
Harper, G. H. (ed.), Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F. R. S. A Correspondence . . . . .	484	Henshaw, M.: W. O. Wehrle, <i>The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature</i> . . . . .	113
Harris, Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert. I: Von J. — bis Lord Monboddo . . . . .	405	<i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> , Der Hexameter in Goethes <i>Reineke Fuchs</i> und — — — . . . . .	230
Harrold, C. F., Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834 . . . . .	551	Heroic Novel . . . . .	479
Hartman, H. (ed.), Surrey's <i>Fourth Boke of Virgill</i> . . . . .	198	Hersey, F. W. C.: H. Reynolds (ed.), Yeats, Letters to the New Island . . . . .	411
Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie . . . . .	52		

	PAGE		PAGE
Hexameter in Goethes <i>Reineke Fuchs</i> und <i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> , Der —	230	Irving, Washington — and the Storrows. Letters from England and the Continent, 1821-1828 (ed. S. T. Williams)...	67
Hickson, Elizabeth C., The Versification of Thomas Hardy	61	—, the Fosters, and the Forsters	35
Hill, H. W.: T. P. Haviland, The Roman de longue Haleine on English Soil	479	Jack Haggerty	465
Hodges, Richard, <i>A Special Help to Orthographie</i>	64	Jackson, D. K., Four of Poe's Critiques in the Baltimore Newspapers	251
Holloway, O. E.: F. Page, Patmore: a Study in Poetry	409	Jacobi's <i>Werke</i> , Coleridge Marginalia in —	216
Holmes, U. T.: F. Anderson, A Primer of Romance Philology	342	Jameson, R. D.: B. Croce, The Defence of Poetry, Variations on the Theme of Shelley (tr. E. F. Carritt)	480
Holz knecht, K. J.: C. R. Baskervill, V. B. Heltzel and A. H. Nethercot (eds.), Elizabethan and Stuart Plays	553	—: E. G. Moll, The Appreciation of Poetry	480
hoodlum	93	—: H. C. Wyld, Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry	416
Horace and Larra	441	Janot, Some Notes on Volange and —	18
Hotspur's Earthquake	171	Jeanroy, A., La Poésie lyrique des troubadours	126
<i>House of Fame</i> , Precious Stones in <i>The</i> —	312	<i>Jeu de S. Nicolas</i> , Wine reckonings in Bodel's —	9
Howard, L.: H. Blodgett, Walt Whitman in England	408	Jördens, W., Die französischen Ödipusdramen	140
—: C. I. Glicksberg, Walt Whitman and the Civil War	68	<i>John L. Sullivan</i> , Columbia University Phonograph Records of Vachel Lindsay's <i>The Congo, Kansas</i> , —	414
—: C. Gohdes and P. F. Baum (eds.), Letters of W. M. Rossetti	556	Johnson, F. R., A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700	206
—: F. Stovall, Walt Whitman	408	— and S. V. Larkey, Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Idea of the Infinity of the Universe in 1576	415
Howarth, R. G., Some Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset	457	Johnson, An Unpublished Letter Concerning Percy's <i>Reliques</i>	509
Hughes, The Printing of John —' Edition of Spenser, 1715	151	— Handbook, A —	65
Hughes, M. Y.: H. B. Lathrop, Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620	195	Jones, C., A Smollett Letter	242
Hugo, Victor — and the Doctrine of the Right to Work	71	Jones, C. E., Christ a Fury?	41
Hurd, The Correspondence of Richard — and William Mason, and Letters of Richard — to Thomas Gray (eds. E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley)	60	—, Notes on <i>Fulgens and Lucrez</i>	508
Hyder, C. K., Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame	59	Jones, F. L., Two Notes on <i>Epipsychidion</i>	40
Hymn, The Macaronic — Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature	113	Jones, H. S. V.: F. R. Johnson, A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700	206
Identifications in <i>Colin Clout's Come Home Againe</i>	155	—: A. C. Judson, Spenser in Southern Ireland	206
<i>Inferno</i> , Dante's — (tr. L. Binyon)	68		
Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope, L'	475		

PAGE	PAGE
Judge, C. B., Elizabethan Book-Pirates ..... 137	Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's <i>Bradamante</i> ..... 169
Judgments of Voltaire by Contemporaries, Some ..... 439	La Bergerie, Rougier de..... 427
Judson, A. C., Spenser in Southern Ireland ..... 206	Lamb, Charles — and his Contemporaries ..... 271
Kansas, Columbia University Phonograph Records of Vachel Lindsay's <i>The Congo</i> , —, John L. Sullivan..... 414	—, Essays and Characters: — to Thompson (ed. R. Withington) ..... 68
Kapp, R., Heilige und Heiligenlegende in England..... 543	Lancaster, H. C.: W. Jördens, Die französischen Ödipusdramen ..... 140
Karpeles, Maud and C. J. Sharp (eds.), English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians ..... 102	—, Lope's <i>Peregrino</i> , Hardy, Rotrou, and Beys..... 75
Kaufmann, F. W.: R. Klibansky (ed.), Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina..... 401	—: Mary E. Storer, Contes de fées du Grand Siècle.... 413
Kent, Elizabeth E., Goldsmith and his Booksellers..... 477	Larkey, S. V. and F. R. Johnson, Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Idea of the Infinity of the Universe in 1576..... 415
Kies, P. P., Lessing and Burnaby 225	Larra, <i>La Nochebuena de 1836</i> 441
Kilbourne, R.: Mildred C. Struble, A Johnson Handbook 65	Lathrop, H. B.: H. Hartman (ed.), Surrey's <i>Fourth Boke of Virgill</i> ..... 198
Kingsley, Charles — ..... 482	—, Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620 ..... 195
Kirk, R. (ed.), Massinger, <i>The City-Madam</i> ..... 208	Lautwandel, Vom Wesen des —s ..... 341
Klibansky, R. (ed.), Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina ..... 401	Le Brun, Ecouchard..... 427
Knappen, M. M. (ed.), Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries. 137	<i>Legends of Angria</i> , see Brontë, Charlotte.
<i>Knight's Tale</i> , The So-Called Prologue to the — ..... 296	Le Mierre..... 427
Knowles, Sheridan — and the Theatre of his Time..... 56	Lemmi, C. W., Symbolism in <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II. 12..... 161
Körner, J. (ed.), Friedrich Schlegel, Neue philosophische Schriften ..... 468	—, The Serpent and the Eagle in Spenser and Shelley.... 165
Koller, Katherine, Identifications in <i>Colin Clout's Come Home Again</i> ..... 155	Léonard, N.-G..... 427
Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten, Der — (eds. W. Göcking, T. Abele und M. J. Böhnert) ..... 123	Lessing and Burnaby..... 225
Krappe, A. H., The Date of <i>Cyperis de Vigneau</i> .... 343, 345	Letters of William Michael Rossetti (eds. C. Gohdes and P. F. Baum)..... 556
Krumpelmann, J. T., <i>Hoodlum</i> 93	— to the New Island. By William Butler Yeats (ed. H. Reynolds) ..... 411
Kurrelmeyer, W.: M. Reu, Luther's German Bible.... 397	Levy, M., Der Sabbath in England ..... 544
—: H. Vollmer and others, Bibel und deutsche Kultur.. 471	Levy, R.: M. K. Pope. From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman ..... 130
—, "Wes das Herz voll ist, des gehet der Mund über".. 380	—: W. von Wartburg, Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois ..... 128
	Lewis, M. G., <i>Tales of Wonder</i> 513

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Life of Bolingbroke</i> , Goldsmith's		MacClintock, W. D., Joseph	
— — — and the <i>Biographia</i>		Warton's <i>Essay on Pope</i> , A	
<i>Britannica</i> .....	25	History of the Five Editions	69
Lindsay, J. I., Coleridge Mar-		Magic, The Themes of — in	
ginalia in Jacobi's <i>Werke</i> ...	216	Nineteenth Century French	
Lindsay, Columbia University		Fiction .....	413
Phonograph Records of Va-		Mahl, Ilse, <i>Der Prosastil in den</i>	
chel —'s <i>The Congo, Kansas,</i>		<i>Märchen</i> Clemens Brentanos	138
<i>John L. Sullivan</i> .....	414	Malakis, E., Another Feminine	
Linguistic Studies of 1933 and		Answer to Chateaubriand's	
1934, Some — .....	515	Slighting Remarks Made	
<i>Liriche</i> , Desportes and Ariosto:		about Venice in 1806 .....	243
Additional Sources in the <i>Or-</i>		—, Chateaubriand se mé-	
<i>lando</i> and the — .....	174	prend-il sur Avramiotti?....	249
Literature and Pulpit in Mediae-		—, Chateaubriand, Shaw, and	
val England .....	338	Sannazaro .....	346
Loan-Words, The Chronology of		Malone K.: G. Schütte, Our	
French — in English .....	90	Forefathers, the Gothonic	
Lockert, L.: L. Binyon (tr.),		Nations .....	106
Dante's <i>Inferno</i> .....	68	—, Some Linguistic Studies	
Long, O. W.: J. T. Hatfield,		of 1933 and 1934 .....	515
New Light on Longfellow..	272	Mansfield, Grace Y. and Eliza-	
Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth		beth B. Greenleaf (eds.), Bal-	
— (ed. O. Shepard) .....	416	lads and Sea Songs of New-	
—, New Light on — .....	272	foundland .....	102
Longi, Olga, <i>La Terre et les</i>		Mansfield, Katherine — and	
<i>morts dans l'œuvre de</i>		Chekhov .....	394
<i>Chateaubriand</i> .....	474	Manuscript Cagné, The Staging	
Lope de Vega, <i>Fuente Ovejuna</i>	179	of the <i>Miracles de Nostre</i>	
—'s <i>Peregrino</i> , Hardy, Ro-		<i>Dame par personnages</i> of the	
trou, and Beys .....	75	— .....	50
Lotspeich, H. G., Spenser's		— of Wyclif's <i>De Dominio</i>	
<i>Urania</i> .....	141	<i>Civili</i> , A Second — .....	96
<i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> , "The		Marinoff, Irene, Neue Wert-	
Masque of the Muscovites"		ungen im englischen Roman.	274
in — — — .....	499	Marivaux, Three French Drama-	
Lowes, J. L., Geoffrey Chaucer		tists, Racine, —, Musset....	131
and the Development of his		Marlowe, Christopher — in Lon-	
Genius .....	111	don .....	203
Luther's German Bible .....	397	—, Peele's <i>Descensus Astraeae</i>	
— New Testament .....	380	and —'s <i>Edward II</i> .....	506
Lyrics, German Romantic —		—, Proverbs and Proverbial	
(ed. W. Silz) .....	123	Allusions in — .....	347
Lyrik, Romantische — (ed. M.		Marquise du <i>Bourgeois gentil-</i>	
Sommerfeld) .....	123	<i>homme</i> , La — .....	369
Lyrische Weltichtung in deut-		Martino, P. et E. Eggli, <i>Le</i>	
tschen Übertragungen aus 7		<i>Débat romantique en France,</i>	
Jahrhunderten (eds. J. Peter-		1813-1830 .....	134
sen und E. Trunz) .....	123	Marwell, H., Thomas Percy,	
Lyttelton, A Minor Augustan		Studien zur Entstehungsge-	
... Life and Works of		schichte seiner Werke .....	486
George, Lord — .....	552	Mason, J. F.: A. Tilley, Three	
		French Dramatists, Racine,	
		Marivaux, Musset .....	131
		Mason, The Correspondence of	
		Richard Hurd and William	
		—, and Letters of Richard	
Macaronic Hymn Tradition in			
Mediaeval English Literature,			
The — .....	113		



PAGE	PAGE
Hurd to Thomas Gray (eds. E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley) 60	Meritt, H., An OE. Gloss: <i>Ober eliman.immannorum</i> ..... 77
"Masque of the Muscovites" in <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> . . . . 499	Metzdorf, R. F., An Unpub- lished Johnson Letter Con- cerning Percy's <i>Reliques</i> .... 509
Massinger, <i>The City-Madam</i> ... 173	Miller, Meta H.: Dorothy Doo- little, The Relations between Literature and Mediaeval Studies in France from 1820- 1860 ..... 48
—, — (ed. R. Kirk)..... 208	Miller's Prologue, A Note on the — ..... 311
Maxwell, B., The Date of Flet- cher's <i>The Night-Walker</i> .... 487	Millevoe ..... 427
McCue, G. S., A Seventeenth- Century Gulliver..... 32	Milton, Defoe on — ..... 31
McIlwraith, A. K., The Printer's Copy for <i>The City-Madam</i> ... 173	—, Symmetry in —'s <i>Samson Agonistes</i> ..... 355
McKay, Ruth C., George Giss- ing and his Critic, Frank Swinerton ..... 407	—'s Blindness..... 402
McManaway, J. G., E. Green- law, R. Heffner, E. A. Strath- mann (eds.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book II..... 186	Minor Augustan . . . Life and Works of George, Lord Lyt- telton ..... 552
—: R. Kirk (ed.), <i>The City- Madam</i> A Comedy by Philip Massinger ..... 208	<i>Miracles de Notre Dame par personnages</i> , The Staging of the — of the MS. Cangé.... 50
—: R. Withington (ed.), Essays and Characters: Lamb to Thompson..... 68	Modena Troupe in England, The — ..... 367
—: R. Withington (ed.), Essays and Characters: Mon- taigne to Goldsmith..... 68	Modern Plays (ed. S. M. Tucker) ..... 70
Medieval England, Literature and Pulpit in — ..... 338	— Prose Style..... 555
— English Literature, The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in — ..... 113	Molière, <i>Le Bourgeois gentil- homme</i> ..... 369
— French Analogue to the Dunmow Flitch, A — ..... 322	Moll, E. G., The Appreciation of Poetry..... 480
— Studies, The Relations be- tween Literature and — in France from 1820-1860.... 48	Monboddó, Englische Sprach- philosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert. I: Von J. Harris bis Lord — ..... 405
Medwall, <i>Fulgens and Lucres</i> .. 508	Montaigne, Essays and Charac- ters: — to Goldsmith (ed. R. Withington)..... 68
Meeks, L. H., Sheridan Knowles and the Theatre of his Time 56	Most Difficult Passage of <i>Don Quixote</i> , The —.... 182; cf. 375
Meilhac and Halévy, <i>L'Été de la Saint-Martin</i> ..... 21	Motteux, Peter Anthony —, 1663-1718: A Biographical and Critical Study..... 403
Melcher, Edith: Edna C. Fred- rick, The Plot and its Con- struction in Eighteenth Cen- tury Criticism of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais..... 404	Musique, Les Romantiques fran- çais et la — ..... 412
Menner, R. J.: I. Gollancz (ed.), <i>Cleanness</i> , Glossary and Illus- trative Texts ..... 336	Musset, Three French Drama- tists, Racine, Marivaux, —.. 131
Meredith, George — and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence 407	<i>Mutabilitie</i> , Two Notes on the Philosophy of — ..... 154
	N, Portuguese Intervocalic —.. 16
	Neglected Letters of Voltaire, Some — ..... 215
	Nethercot, A. H., V. B. Heltzel and C. R. Baskervill (eds.), Elizabethan and Stuart Plays 553

	PAGE		PAGE
Nettleton, G. H., Author's Changes in Dryden's <i>Conquest of Granada, Part I</i> .....	360	Owst, G. R., Literature and Pul- pit in Medieval England....	338
Neue philosophische Schriften, Friedrich Schlegel's — — — (ed. J. Körner).....	468	Padelford, F. M.: E. K. Cham- bers, Sir Thomas Wyatt and Some Collected Studies.....	207
— Wertungen im englischen Roman .....	274	—, C. Osgood, E. Greenlaw (eds.), <i>The Works of Ed- mund Spenser, A Variorum Edition</i> .....	186
New Light on Longfellow.....	272	— (ed.), <i>The Axiachus</i> of Plato Translated by Edmund Spenser .....	191
Newfoundland, Ballads and Sea Songs of — (eds. Elizabeth B. Greenleaf and Grace Y. Mansfield) .....	102	— (ed.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book III.....	186
Newman, Cardinal — and Wil- liam Froude, F. R. S. A Corre- spondence (ed. G. H. Harper) ..	484	Page, F., Patmore: a Study in Poetry .....	409
<i>Night-Walker</i> , The Date of Fletcher's <i>The</i> —.....	487	Page, Nadine, Beatrice: "My Lady Disdain".....	494
Nineteenth Century and After, The —.....	119	Painter, S.: N. J. O'Connor, Godes Peace and the Queens: Vicissitudes of a house 1539- 1615 .....	545
<i>Nochebuena de 1836 y su modelo horaciano, La</i> —.....	441	—, The Sources of <i>Fouke Fitz Warin</i> .....	13
Northern Antiquities in French Learning and Literature (1755-1855) .....	47	Pardoner's Prologue, A Note on Chaucer's —.....	310
<b>Ober eliman.innannorum</b> , An OE. Gloss: — — —.....	77	Parker, W. R., Symmetry in Milton's <i>Samson Agonistes</i> ..	355
Observations on Some Tenden- cies of Sentiment and Ethics ..	548	Parlett, Mathilde: P. Bour- l'honne, George Eliot: <i>Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-1854</i> .....	275
O'Connor, N. J., Godes Peace and the Queens: Vicissitudes of a house 1539-1615.....	545	Parrott, T. M.: E. E. Stoll, Art and Artifice in Shakespeare ..	200
Ödipusdramen, Die französischen — .....	140	Parsons, C. O., Dryden's Letter of Attorney.....	364
OE. Gloss: <i>Ober eliman.innan- norum</i> , An —.....	77	Patch, H. R., Precious Stones in <i>The House of Fame</i> .....	312
Oras, A.: O. Funke, Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert.....	405	Patmore: a Study in Poetrv..	409
Orient in American Tran- scendentalism, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott, The —.....	58	Patois. Bibliographie des dic- tionnaires —.....	128
Origin of a Ballad, The —....	465	Peacock, George Meredith and Thomas Love —: A Study in Literary Influence.....	407
<i>Orlando</i> , Desportes and Ariosto: Additional Sources in the — and the <i>Liriche</i> .....	174	Pearce, E. H. and L. Whibley (eds.), <i>The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray</i> .....	60
<i>Orthographie, A Special Help to</i> — .....	64	Peck, L. F., Southey and <i>Tales of Wonder</i> .....	513
Osgood, C., E. Greenlaw, F. M. Padelford (eds.), <i>The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Vari- orum Edition</i> .....	186	Peele's <i>Descensus Astraeae</i> and Marlowe's <i>Edward II</i> .....	506
Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations .....	106	Penn, Dorothy, The Staging of the <i>Miracles de Notre Dame</i>	

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>par personnages</i> of the MS.		Pope, The Early Career of Alexander —	547
Cangé .....	50	Pope, M. K., From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman .....	130
Percy, Editions of —'s Memoir of Goldsmith .....	464	Porto-Riche et Rostand .....	446
—, Thomas —, Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte seiner Werke .....	486	Portuguese Intervocalic <i>n</i> .....	16
—'s <i>Reliques</i> , An Unpublished Johnson Letter Concerning — .....	509	Possible Relation between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth, A — .....	318
<i>Peregrino</i> , Lope's —, Hardy, Rotrou, and Beys .....	75	Poussin Doctor, The — .....	506
Petersen, J., Die Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung ..	268	Pratt, R. A.: J. L. Lowes, Geoffrey Chaucer and the Development of his Genius .....	111
— und E. Trunz (eds.), Lyrische Weltichtung in deutschen Übertragungen aus 7 Jahrhunderten .....	123	Precious Stones in <i>The House of Fame</i> .....	312
Philosophy of <i>Mutabilitie</i> , Two Notes on the — .....	154	Price, H. T. (ed.), John Ghesel, <i>The Rule of Health</i> .....	64
Pike, R. E., A Sixteenth-Century Substitution in the <i>Roman de Mandevie</i> .....	325	Priest, G. M., Anthology of the Classical Period of German Literature .....	276
Place-Name, English — Puzzles .....	535	Primer of Romance Philology, A — .....	342
—s, English — in the Light of the Terminal Theory .....	535	Printer's Copy for <i>The City-Madam</i> , The — .....	173
Plato, The <i>Amoichus</i> of — Translated by Edmund Spenser ..	191	Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser, 1715, The —	151
Plays, Modern — (ed. S. M. Tucker) .....	70	— of the First Folio of Shakespeare, The — .....	139
Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais ..	404	<i>Prioresse's Tale</i> , Another Analogue to <i>The</i> — .....	307
— of Conrad's <i>The Duel</i> , The — .....	385	Proctor, P. D.: Fannie E. Ratchford and W. C. De Vane (eds.), Charlotte Brontë, <i>Legends of Angria</i> .....	121
Poe's Critiques in the Baltimore Newspapers, Four of —	251	Prosastil in den Märchen Clemens Brentanos, Der — .....	138
Poesia di Shelley, La — .....	66	Prose Style, Modern — .....	555
Poésie lyrique des troubadours, La — .....	126	Proust, Comment Marcel — a composé son roman .....	43
Poetry, Patmore: a Study in —	409	Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe .....	347
—, Some Aspects of the Diction of English — .....	416	—, Chaucer's Use of — .....	332
—, The Appreciation of — ..	480	Pseudonyms, Voltaire and Baillet's Manual of — .....	209
—, The Defence of —, Variations on the Theme of Shelley	480	Purcell, J. M., <i>Victorian and Arride</i> .....	328
Pope, Joseph Warton's <i>Essay on</i> —, A History of the Five Editions .....	69	Puritan Diaries, Two Elizabethan — — (ed. M. M. Knappen) .....	137
Pope, L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de — .....	475	Quijote, Sobre el pasaje del — referente al <i>Tirant lo Blanch</i>	375
—, Poetry and Prose (ed. H. V. D. Dyson) .....	66	Racine, Three French Dramatists, —, Marivaux, Musset ..	131

PAGE	PAGE
Rader, M. M.: Alice D. Snyder (ed.), S. T. Coleridge's <i>Treatise on Method</i> as published in the <i>Encyclopaedia Metropolitana</i> ..... 549	teenth-Century Substitution in the — — — ..... 325
Rao, A. V., A Minor Augustan ... Life and Works of George, Lord Lyttelton ..... 552	Romance Philology, A Primer of — — — ..... 342
Ratchford, Fannie E. and W. C. De Vane (eds.), Charlotte Brontë, <i>Legends of Angria</i> .. 121	Romantic Lyrics, German — — (ed. W. Silz) ..... 123
Ray, J. K. and M. P. Tilley, Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe ..... 347	Romantiques français et la musique, Les — ..... 412
Raymond, W. O.: W. C. De Vane (ed.), The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning.. 486	Romantische Lyrik (ed. M. Sommerfeld) ..... 123
Reeves, W. P., A Second MS. of Wyclif's <i>De Dominio Civili</i> 96	Root, R. K.: G. Sherburn, The Early Career of Alexander Pope ..... 547
Reichart, W. A., Washington Irving, the Fosters, and the Forsters ..... 35	Ross, W. O., Another Analogue to <i>The Prioresses Tale</i> ..... 307
<i>Reineke Fuchs</i> , Der Hexameter in Goethes — — und <i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> ..... 230	Rossetti, Letters of William Michael — (eds. C. Gohdes and P. F. Baum) ..... 556
Relations between Literature and Mediaeval Studies in France from 1820-1860, The — 48	Rostand, Porto-Riche et — ..... 446
<i>Reliques</i> , An Unpublished Johnson Letter Concerning Percy's — ..... 509	Rotrou, Lope's <i>Peregrino</i> , Hardy, —, and Beys ..... 75
Renzulli, M., La Poesia di Shelley ..... 66	Roucher ..... 427
Restoration "Improvement" of Thomas Dekker, A — ..... 460	Rousseau, Jean-Jacques — Moral- alist ..... 266
— Theater, Songs from the — — (ed. W. Thorp) ..... 554	Routh, H. V., The Nineteenth Century and After ..... 119
Reu, M., Luther's German Bible 397	<i>Rule of Health, The</i> — (ed. H. T. Price) ..... 64
Reynolds, H. (ed.), Yeats, Let- ters to the New Island ..... 411	Ruud, M. B.: F. N. Robinson (ed.), The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer ..... 329
Riche, Belphegor in <i>Grim the Collier</i> and —'s <i>Farewell</i> ..... 99	—: J. W. Spargo, Chaucer's <i>Shipman's Tale: the Lover's Gift Regained</i> ..... 335
Robinson, F. N. (ed.), The Com- plete Works of Geoffrey Chau- cer ..... 329	Sabbath in England, Der —... 544
Robles, J., Sobre la fecha de <i>Fuente Ovejuna</i> ..... 179	Sackville, Charles, see above, Dorset.
Rogger, K., Vom Wesen des Lautwandels ..... 341	Saint-Amant as "Preromantic" 456
Rollins, H. E. (ed.), <i>Brittons Bower of Delights</i> , 1591.... 115	Saint-Lambert ..... 427
—: M. M. Knappen (ed.), Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries ..... 137	Sampley, A. M., Peele's <i>Descen- sus Astraeae</i> and Marlowe's <i>Edward II</i> ..... 506
Roman de longue Haine on English Soil, The — ..... 479	<i>Samson Agonistes</i> , Symmetry in Milton's — ..... 355
<i>Roman de Mandevie</i> , A Six-	<i>Sandford and Merton</i> , A French Adaptation of — — — ..... 238
	Sannazaro, Chateaubriand, Shaw, and — ..... 346
	Saxl, F. (ed.), Vorträge 1930- 1931: England und die Antike 62
	Schaffer, A.: W. T. Bandy, Baudelaire Judged by His Contemporaries (1845-1867). 46
	Schinz, A.: C. W. Hendel, Jean- Jacques Rousseau Moral- ist.. 266
	Schlegel, Friedrich, Neue philo-

PAGE	PAGE
sophische Schriften (ed. J. Körner) . . . . . 468	Shelley, La Poesia di — . . . . . 66
Schneider, Elisabeth, Katherine Mansfield and Chekhov . . . . . 394	—, <i>Prometheus Unbound</i> . . . . . 41
—, The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism . . . . . 407	—, The Defence of Poetry, Variations on the Theme of — . . . . . 480
Schücking, L. L., Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im Beowulfepos . . . . . 108	—, The Serpent and the Eagle in Spenser and — . . . . . 165
Schütte, G., Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations . . . . . 106	Shepard, O. (ed.), Henry Wadsworth Longfellow . . . . . 416
Schulze, I. L., Elizabethan Chivalry and the Faerie Queene's Annual Feast . . . . . 158	—: M. Renzulli, La Poesia di Shelley . . . . . 66
Sea Songs, Ballads and — of Newfoundland (eds. Elizabeth B. Greenleaf and Grace Y. Mansfield) . . . . . 102	—: Eleanor M. Sickels, The Gloomy Egoist . . . . . 64
<i>Secunda Pastorum</i> . . . . . 95	Sherburn, G.: E. Audra, L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope . . . . . 475
Seeber, E. D., Anti-Slavery Opinion in the Poems of Some Early French Followers of James Thomson . . . . . 427	—: H. V. D. Dyson (ed.), Pope, Poetry and Prose . . . . . 66
Segraï, Jean Regnaud de —, l'homme et son œuvre . . . . . 204	—, The Early Career of Alexander Pope . . . . . 547
Sehnsucht nach dem Dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung, Die — . . . . . 268	<i>Shipman's Tale</i> , Chaucer's — the Lover's Gift Regained . . . . . 335
Sentiment, Observations on Some Tendencies of — and Ethics . . . . . 548	Shorter Poems of Robert Browning, The — (ed. W. C. De Vane) . . . . . 486
Serpent and the Eagle in Spenser and Shelley, The — . . . . . 165	Sickels, Eleanor M., The Gloomy Egoist . . . . . 64
Seventeenth Century French Tragedy, <i>L'Art de Régner</i> in — — — — — . . . . . 417	Silz, W. (ed.), German Romantic Lyrics . . . . . 123
— — — — — Gulliver, A — . . . . . 32	Sixteenth-Century Substitution in the <i>Roman de Mandevie</i> , A — . . . . . 325
Shakespeare, Art and Artifice in — . . . . . 200	Skinner, L. H., Collin d'Harleville Dramatist . . . . . 133
—, <i>I Henry IV</i> . . . . . 171	Slavery, Anti- — Opinion in the Poems of Some Early French Followers of James Thomson . . . . . 427
—, <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> . . . . . 499	Smith, A. L.: E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley (eds.), The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray . . . . . 60
—, <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> . . . . . 494	Smith, H.: T. J. Beck, Northern Antiquities in French Learning and Literature (1755-1855) . . . . . 47
—, The Printing of the First Folio of — . . . . . 139	Smollett Letter, A — . . . . . 242
Sharp, C. J. and Maud Karpeles (eds.), English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians . . . . . 102	Snyder, Alice D. (ed.), S. T. Coleridge's <i>Treatise on Method</i> as published in the <i>Encyclopaedia Metropolitana</i> . . . . . 549
Shaver, C. L., A Mediaeval French Analogue to the Dunmow Flitch . . . . . 322	So-Called Prologue to the <i>Knight's Tale</i> , The — . . . . . 296
Shaw, Chateaubriand, —, and Sannazaro . . . . . 346	Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry . . . . . 416
Shelley, <i>Epipsychidion</i> . . . . . 40	Sommerfeld, M. (ed.), Romanische Lyrik . . . . . 123

PAGE	PAGE
Songs from the Restoration Theater (ed. W. Thorp)....	554
— of the Reign of Henry VIII, New .....	452
— of Thomas D'Urfey, The — (ed. C. L. Day).....	118
Sorensen, F., "The Masque of the Muscovites" in <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> .....	499
Source of Conrad's <i>Suspense</i> , A —.....	390
—s of <i>Fouke Fitz Warin</i> , The —.....	13
Southerne, Thomas — Dramatist .....	70
Southey and <i>Tales of Wonder</i> .....	513
Spargo, J. W., Chaucer's <i>Shipman's Tale</i> : the Lover's Gift Regained .....	335
Sparnaay, H., Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie .....	52
<i>Special Help to Orthographie</i> , A —.....	64
Spencer, H.: F. I. Carpenter (ed.), Ralph Waldo Emerson: Representative Selections....	416
—: Columbia University Phonograph Records of Vachel Lindsay's <i>The Congo, Kansas, John L. Sullivan</i> .....	414
—: J. W. Dodds, Thomas Southerne Dramatist.....	70
—: J. J. Elson (ed.), <i>The Wits; or, Sport upon Sport</i> .....	139
—: O. Shepard (ed.), Henry Wadsworth Longfellow .....	416
—: S. M. Tucker (ed.), Modern Plays.....	70
—: A. Warren (ed.), Nathaniel Hawthorne .....	416
—: E. E. Willoughby, The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare .....	139
Spenser, A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund — Printed before 1700.....	206
—, <i>Cantos of Mutabilitie</i> ....	154
—, <i>Colin Clout's Come Home Again</i> .....	155
—, Edmund —: A Critical Study .....	192
— in Southern Ireland.....	206
—, The <i>Asiarchus</i> of Plato Translated by Edmund —...	191
—, <i>The Faerie Queene</i> 146, 158, 161, 168, 186	
Spenser, The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of —, 1715	151
—, The Serpent and the Eagle in — and Shelley.....	165
—, The Works of Edmund —, A Variorum Edition....	186
—'s <i>Urania</i> .....	141
Spiller, R. E.: S. T. Williams (ed.), Washington Irving and the Storrows. Letters from England and the Continent, 1821-1828 .....	67
Spitzer, L.: K. Rogger, Vom Wesen des Lautwandels....	341
Sprachphilosophie, Englische — im späteren 18. Jahrhundert	405
Staging of the <i>Miracles de Notre Dame par personnages</i> of the MS. Cangé, The —....	50
Steiner, A., Reply.....	345
Steinhauer, H., The Symbolism in Hauptmann's <i>Veland</i> .....	258
Stevenson, Hazel A., A Possible Relation between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth.....	318
Stimson, Dorothy: F. R. Johnson and S. V. Larkey, Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Idea of Infinity of the Universe in 1576.....	415
Stirling, B., Two Notes on the Philosophy of <i>Mutabilitie</i> ..	154
Stoll, E. E., Art and Artifice in Shakespeare .....	200
Storer, Mary E., Contes de fées du Grand Siècle.....	413
—: Wessie M. Tipping, Jean Regnaud de Segrais, l'homme et son œuvre.....	204
Storrows, Washington Irving and the —. Letters from England and the Continent, 1821-1828 (ed. S. T. Williams)...	67
Stovall, F., Walt Whitman....	408
Strathmann, E. A., E. Greenlaw, R. Heffner, J. G. McManaway (eds.), <i>The Faerie Queene</i> , Book II.....	186
—: H. E. Rollins (ed.), <i>Brittons Bowre of Delights</i> , 1591 .....	115
Struble, Mildred C., A Johnson Handbook .....	65
Stuart Plays, Elizabethan and — — (eds. C. R. Baskervill,	

PAGE	PAGE
V. B. Heltzel and A. H. Nethercot) ..... 553	Thorp, Margaret F.: S. E. Baldwin, Charles Kingsley..... 482
<i>Sublime and Beautiful</i> , The Date of Burke's—..... 29	Thorp, W. (ed.), Songs from the Restoration Theater.... 554
Suckling, An Attribution to — 463	Three French Dramatists, Racine, Marivaux, Musset..... 131
Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in <i>Beowulf</i> ..... 88	Tilley, A., Three French Dramatists, Racine, Marivaux, Musset ..... 131
Surrey's <i>Fourth Boke of Virgill</i> (ed. H. Hartman)..... 198	Tilley, M. P. and J. K. Ray, Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe..... 347
<i>Suspense</i> , A Source of Conrad's —..... 390	Tipping, Wessie M., Jean Regnaud de Segrais, l'homme et son œuvre ..... 204
Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame ..... 59	<i>Tirant lo Blanch</i> , Sobre el pasaje del <i>Quijote</i> referente al — ..... 375
Swinerton, George Gissing and his Critic, Frank —..... 407	Tooke, Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert. II: Horne — als Sprachphilosoph ..... 405
Symbolism in <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II. 12..... 161	Train, Lilla, Chaucer's <i>ladyes fourre and twenty</i> ..... 85
— in Hauptmann's <i>Veland</i> , The — ..... 258	Tranche de vie, "Une — — —" 265
Symmetry in Milton's <i>Samson Agonistes</i> ..... 355	Transcendentalism, The Orient in American —, A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott 58
Talamon, R., La Marquise du <i>Bourgeois gentilhomme</i> ..... 369	Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620..... 195
—, Porto-Riche et Rostand.. 446	<i>Treatise on Method</i> , S. T. Coleridge's — — — as published in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana (ed. Alice D. Snyder) 549
<i>Tales of Wonder</i> , Southey and — — ..... 513	<i>Troilus</i> , The Date of the —: and Minor Chauceriana..... 277
Tasse, Le Père Bouhours et le — 434	Troubadours, La Poésie lyrique des — ..... 126
Tatlock, J. S. P., The Date of the <i>Troilus</i> : and Minor Chauceriana ..... 277	Trunz, E. und J. Petersen (eds.), Lyrische Weltichtung in deutschen Übertragungen aus 7 Jahrhunderten..... 123
Terminal Theory, English Place-Names in the Light of the — ..... 535	Tucker, S. M. (ed.), Modern Plays ..... 70
Terre et les morts dans l'œuvre de Chateaubriand, La —.... 474	Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries (ed. M. M. Knappen)..... 137
Thackeray's <i>Vanity Fair</i> , Die Erzählkunst in — — —.... 274	University of Texas Studies in English ..... 140
Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction, The — ..... 413	Unpublished Johnson Letter Concerning Percy's <i>Reliques</i> , An —..... 509
Thompson, D. W., Belphegor in <i>Grim the Collier</i> and Riche's <i>Farewell</i> ..... 99	Urania, Spenser's —..... 141
Thompson, S.: L. W. Chappell, John Henry: a Folk-lore Study ..... 485	Ustick, W. L.: Richard Hodges, <i>A Special Help to Orthographie</i> ..... 64
Thompson, Essays and Characters: Lamb to — (ed. R. Withington) ..... 68	
Thomson, Anti-Slavery Opinion in the Poems of Some Early French Followers of James — 427	
Thoreau, The Orient in American Transcendentalism, A Study of Emerson, — and Alcott ..... 58	

	PAGE		PAGE
Ustick, W. L.: H. T. Price (ed.), John Ghesel, <i>The Rule of Health</i> .....	64	Weigand, H. J.: J. Petersen, Die Sehnsucht nach dem Drit- ten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung .....	268
—: <i>The Art of Limming</i> ....	64	"Wes das Herz voll ist, des gehet der Mund über".....	380
<b>Vanity Fair</b> , Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's — .....	274	Whibley, L. and E. H. Pearce (eds.), <i>The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Rich- ard Hurd to Thomas Gray</i> ..	60
Vega, See Lope de Vega.		Whiting, B. J., <i>Chaucer's Use of Proverbs</i> .....	332
<i>Veland</i> , The Symbolism in Hauptmann's — .....	258	—: G. R. Owst, <i>Literature and Pulpit in Medieval Eng- land</i> .....	338
Venice, Another Feminine An- swer to Chateaubriand's Slighting Remarks Made about — in 1806 .....	243	Whitman, The 1876 English Subscription for — .....	257
Vergil and Baudelaire .....	446	—, Walt — and the Civil War	68
Versification of Thomas Hardy, The — .....	61	—, Walt — in England....	408
<i>Victorian and Arride</i> .....	328	Wiley, A. N., <i>The Poussin Doc- tor</i> .....	506
<i>Virgill</i> , Surrey's <i>Fourth Boke of</i> — .....	198	Wilkins, F. H.: H. Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue. <i>Studien zu einer Biographie</i> .....	52
Volange and Janot, Some Notes on — .....	18	Williams, E. B., <i>Portuguese Intervocalic n</i> .....	16
Vollmer, H. and others, <i>Bibel und deutsche Kultur</i> .....	471	Williams, S. T. (ed.), Wash- ington Irving and the Stor- rows. <i>Letters from England and the Continent, 1821-1828</i>	67
Voltaire and Baillet's <i>Manual of Pseudonyms</i> .....	209	Williamson, G., <i>An Attribution to Suckling</i> .....	463
—, Some Judgments of — by Contemporaries .....	439	—, Hakewill and the Arthur- ian Legend .....	462
—, Some Neglected Letters of — .....	215	Willoughby, E. E., <i>The Printing of the First Folio of Shake- speare</i> .....	139
Vom Wesen des Lautwandels..	341	Wilmer, W. H.: Eleanor G. Brown, <i>Milton's Blindness</i> ..	402
Vorträge 1930-1931: England und die Antike .....	62	Wine Reckonings in Bodel's <i>Jeu de S. Nicolas</i> .....	9
Wade, I., <i>Voltaire and Baillet's Manual of Pseudonyms</i> .....	209	Withington, R. (ed.), <i>Essays and Characters: Lamb to Thompson</i> .....	68
Wager, W. J., <i>The So-Called Prologue to the Knight's Tale</i>	290	— (ed.), <i>Essays and Charac- ters: Montaigne to Goldsmith</i>	68
Wagner, B. M. <i>New Songs of the Reign of Henry VIII</i> ...	452	—, "Water Fastand".....	95
Warren, A. (ed.), Nathaniel Hawthorne .....	416	<i>Wits; or, Sport upon Sport, The</i> — (ed. J. J. Elson)....	139
Warburg, W. von, <i>Bibliog- raphie des dictionnaires patois</i> .....	128	Wood, Miriam H., <i>A Source of Conrad's Suspense</i> .....	390
Warton, Joseph —'s <i>Essay on Pope, A History of the Five Editions</i> .....	69	Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition, The —..	186
"Water Fastand" .....	95	Wright, J. G.: Dorothy Penn, <i>The Staging of the Miracles</i>	
Weatherly, E. H., <i>A Note on Chaucer's Pardoner's Pro- logue</i> .....	310		
Weber, C. J., <i>Care and Careless- ness in Hardy</i> .....	41		
Wehrle, W. O., <i>The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature</i> .....	113		



	PAGE		PAGE
<i>de Nostre Dame par person-</i>		Yeats, W. B., Letters to the	
<i>nages of the MS. Cangé....</i>	50	New Island (ed. H. Reynolds)	411
Wurtsbaugh, J., Thomas Ed-		Young, K., A Note on Chaucer's	
wards and the Editorship of		Friar .....	83
the <i>Faerie Queene</i> .....	146	Zachrisson, R. E., English Place-	
Wyatt, Sir Thomas — and Some		Name Puzzles .....	535
Collected Studies .....	207	——, English Place-Names in	
Wyclif, A Second MS. of —'s		the Light of the Terminal	
<i>De Dominio Civili</i> .....	95	Theory .....	535
Wyld, H. C., Some Aspects of		Zeydel, E. H.: J. Körner (ed.),	
the Diction of English Poetry	416	Friedrich Schlegel, Neue	
		philosophische Schriften.....	468